

The LUTHERAN C H U R C H QUARTERLY

Volume XII

OCTOBER, 1939

Number 4

WHAT THEOLOGICAL LANGUAGE DO YOU SPEAK?

By William C. Berkemeyer

IS HISTORY TRUSTWORTHY?

By Theodore G. Tappert

THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE

By Emil E. Fischer

THE SENSE OF THE SACRED

By John Aberly

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION TOMORROW

By Ralph D. Heim

The Futility of the Censorship in 18th Century France *By Albert Bachman*
A New Standard for Confirmed Membership *By Paul E. Keyser*
American Lutheran Preaching *By T. Benton Peery*
Luther's Musical Education and Activities *By Ulrich Leupold*

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS

INDEX TO VOLUME XII

TIMES AND NEWS PUBLISHING COMPANY
GETTYSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE	338
--------------------------------------	-----

ARTICLES

WHAT THEOLOGICAL LANGUAGE DO YOU SPEAK? <i>By William C. Berkemeyer</i>	339
IS HISTORY TRUSTWORTHY? <i>By Theodore G. Tappert</i>	349
THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE. <i>By Emil E. Fischer</i>	363
THE SENSE OF THE SACRED. <i>By John Aberly</i>	375
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION TOMORROW. <i>By Ralph D. Heim</i>	384

NOTES AND STUDIES

THE FUTILITY OF THE CENSORSHIP IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY FRANCE. <i>By Albert Bachman</i>	398
A NEW STANDARD FOR CONFIRMED MEMBERSHIP. <i>By Paul E. Keyser</i>	402
AMERICAN LUTHERAN PREACHING. <i>By T. Benton Peery</i>	410
LUTHER'S MUSICAL EDUCATION AND ACTIVITIES. <i>By Ulrich Leupold</i>	423

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS

Hopwood, <i>A Testament of Faith</i> (John Aberly)	429
Guillaume, <i>Prophecy and Divination</i> (Herbert C. Alleman)	429
Gardner-Smith, <i>Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels</i> (Herbert C. Alleman)	430
Parsons, <i>The Religion of the New Testament</i> (R. T. Stamm)	431
Chamberlin, <i>Making the Bible Live</i> (W. C. Waltemyer)	433
Lewis, <i>The Faith We Declare</i> (E. E. Fischer)	433
Jeremias, <i>Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu</i> (John C. Mattes)	434
——, <i>Hat die älteste Christenheit die Kindertaufe geübt?</i> (John C. Mattes)	435
Macfarland, <i>I Was in Prison</i> (H. D. Hoover)	435
Schilder, <i>Christ on Trial</i> (Fred W. Kern)	435
Bezzel, <i>Das Heil von Golgatha</i> (M. O. Dietrich)	437
Hoenecke, <i>A Lamb Goes Uncomplaining Forth</i> (H. D. Hoover)	437
Freseman, <i>The Tragedy of Calvary</i> (C. P. Swank)	438
Schneider, <i>The Door of Hope</i> (C. P. Swank)	439
Golladay, <i>The Son of God Rides On</i> (Alfred J. Krahmer)	440
Young, <i>Come into My Heart</i> (Alfred J. Krahmer)	440
Neumann, <i>A Book of Prayers for Boys and Girls</i> (Alfred J. Krahmer)	440
Riley, <i>Wives of the Bible</i> (H. E. Horn)	440
Savage, <i>The Grip That Holds</i> (H. E. Horn)	440
Webb, <i>At the Gates of Mercy</i> (H. E. Horn)	440
Marquardt, <i>Why Was I Not Told?</i> (Henry Cornehlisen, Jr.)	441
Kunze, <i>Gespräch mit Berneuchen</i> (John C. Mattes)	441
Vår Lutherske Arv (Benjamin Lotz)	441
Schmidt, <i>Religionen Hos Urkulturens Folk</i> (Benjamin Lotz)	442
Golladay, <i>The Cross Athwart the Sky</i> (H. D. Hoover)	442
Graebner, <i>A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians</i> (H. D. Hoover)	442
Beer and Galling, <i>Exodus</i> (Handbuch zum Alten Testament) (J. M. Myers)	443
Caiger, <i>Archaeology and the New Testament</i> (J. M. Myers)	444

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY

Editors

Theodore G. Tappert
Emil E. Fischer
Philadelphia

Harvey D. Hoover
Raymond T. Stamm
Gettysburg

Volume XII

October, 1939

Number 4

Published quarterly by the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, and the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly* (founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849) and *The Lutheran Church Review* (founded in Philadelphia in 1882). Entered at the Gettysburg Post Office as second-class matter.

Indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals*.

Subscription \$2.50 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents. Subscriptions and all business communications should be addressed to Professor Harvey D. Hoover, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

Manuscripts, books for review, and other editorial correspondence should be addressed to Professor Theodore G. Tappert, 7333 Germantown Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The aims of THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY are (1) to give intellectual expression to the faith of the United Lutheran Church in America as set forth in its doctrinal basis, to maintain that faith, and to show constantly its relation to the practical religious living of those who hold it; (2) to promote cordial understandings between the bodies of Lutherans, both in America and Europe, and between Lutheran and other Christian groups; (3) to discuss, in a constructive and helpful manner, the relation of the faith of the Lutheran Church to the religious issues involved in contemporary life and thought.

The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they shall be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they shall be free from controversial animus; and that their contents shall be of real scholarly and practical value to the reader. THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY shall be conducted with due regard for the Christian liberty which proves all things and holds fast that which is good, and for which the Lutheran Church has always stood. Difference of opinion, between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, will not of itself exclude articles from publication, since the editors will not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors. The editors reserve the right to reject any article without assigning a reason for their action.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

WILLIAM C. BERKEMEYER, after serving for two years as fellow in the Philadelphia Seminary, assumed his present pastorate, St. Matthew's Lutheran Church, Bethlehem, Pa.

JOHN ABERLY is professor of Systematic Theology and president of the Gettysburg Seminary.

On Sept. 28, 1939, RALPH D. HEIM was inaugurated as the East Pennsylvania Synod professor of English Bible and Religious Education, in the Gettysburg Seminary, succeeding the late M. Hadwin Fischer. Professor Heim was formerly dean and professor of Religion and Religious Education at Hartwick College, Oneonta, N. Y.

During his sabbatical leave, June 1938-Feb. 1939, ALBERT BACHMAN, who is head of the department of Romance Languages at Gettysburg College, gathered the material for the second volume of his work on the Censorship in 18th Century France, covering the period from 1750-1763. A third volume will bring the study to the outbreak of the French Revolution.

PAUL E. KEYSER, pastor of the First Evangelical Lutheran Church, Ridgway, Pa., is chairman of the special committee of the Pittsburgh Synod on "Standard of Active Confirmed Membership."

T. BENTON PEERY is pastor of St. Matthew's Lutheran Church, Philadelphia, and vice-president of the East Pennsylvania Conference of the Central Pennsylvania Synod.

ULRICH LEUPOLD, an authority on subjects pertaining to Lutheran music and liturgy, is now assistant pastor in St. Matthew's Church, Kitchener, Ontario. He is the author of *Die liturgischen Gesaenge der evangelischen Kirche im zeitalter der Aufklaerung und der Romantik*, and was co-editor of the *Handbuch der evangelischen Kirchenmusik*.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are M. O. DIETRICH, pastor of Friedens Lutheran Church, Philadelphia; FRED W. KERN, pastor of the First English Lutheran Church, Austin, Texas; ALFRED J. KRAHMER, pastor of Epiphany Lutheran Church, Laurelton, L. I., N. Y.; BENJAMIN LOTZ, pastor of Holy Trinity Lutheran Church, Bethlehem, Pa.; and C. P. SWANK, missionary superintendent of the East Pennsylvania Conference of the Central Pennsylvania Synod of the U. L. C. A.

WHAT THEOLOGICAL LANGUAGE DO YOU SPEAK?

WILLIAM C. BERKEMEYER

Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

THAT no words are adequate to express the grace of God in Christ Jesus, every Christian theologian would humbly hasten to confess. But at the same time he would insist upon the need for theologies, i. e. for systematic, symbolic expression of the truth about God and man, Jesus Christ and the good life. The classic Lutheran theologian would go even beyond this. He would quote with approval, as Sasse does, the word of Harless: "After I had learned from the Scriptures what saving truth is, I turned to the symbolical books of my church. I cannot express how surprised and how moved I was to discover that their content conformed with the convictions I gained from the Scriptures and my experience of faith."¹

The next quite natural step which some Lutherans have taken is that which leads them to insist that only that is Lutheran and true which is in accord with a particular document offered to other Lutherans to be signed "on the dotted line." What can serve as a proper corrective to this kind of development, which begins by confessing that no words are adequate to express the grace of God in Christ Jesus and ends by insisting that only one combination of words is sufficiently adequate to be spiritually trustworthy?

I am suggesting that first of all we need to criticize radically the words which we as theologians employ. For words are only symbols. Edward Bevan, in his Gifford Lectures, published under the title, *Symbolism and Belief*, has pointed out that all symbols are of two types: those that merely point to the things already understood, like a flag of some nation, and those which themselves seek to increase the understanding of the thing signified. In the

1 Herman Sasse, *Here We Stand* (New York: 1938), pp. 171-172.

former class of symbols the connection between the symbol and the thing symbolized may be purely formal and artificial. There need be no actual resemblance between the two. Many of the rites and ceremonies of religion are of this type. But most religious symbols are of the second variety. They offer things presented to the sense or ideas presented to the mind which purport to convey to the worshiper knowledge of the thing beyond the range of any human experience.

But even here there are two types of religious symbols. There are those symbols behind which we can see, the reality of which we feel we can express more adequately in other terms, in which we can distinguish between the reality itself and the symbol that seeks to express it. For example, when the Old Testament speaks of "the hand of God" we have such a symbol. But there are other symbols behind which we cannot see, than which we cannot find a truer suggestion of the Reality they represent. Such Biblical expressions as "the will of God" or "the love of God" belong to this class.

Yet, once again, we may differ as to which terms we assign to these classes. There are those who believe they can find in philosophic thought terms that will serve more satisfactorily in this second class of symbols—more satisfactorily than the anthropomorphic ones used in the Scriptures. Those who move in this direction tend to push the symbolic interpretation of religious truth so far as to substitute general truths even for the particular facts of our faith. They are forced by their own logic to put a purely spiritual idea of Christ in place of the historical Jesus and his ministry. We must be careful to avoid this extreme, for in an historical religion like Christianity persons and acts have unique values because of their place and influence in a temporal process in which each one of us has a place—but which is a process that is unrepeatable.

We do well therefore to retain the anthropomorphic terms of the Bible; for, as Mansel has pointed out, they represent a skepticism that recognizes the limits of thought and the satisfactory

nature of those symbols which are based on our whole experience as human beings.

Thus at the very start of our criticism of our terms, it must be recognized that the best symbols can but point beyond, never describe what is beyond. Plotinus' way is still the only possible way for theologians: "Since no phrase you can use about Supreme Reality is adequate, all you can do is to throw out your phrase at it, and then deny that the phrase is true. This leaves a kind of impression or idea in the hearer's mind, but at the same time prevents him from committing himself too fast and fixedly." The apostle Paul is facing this same difficulty when he writes: "For now we see through a glass darkly." It is that with which Karl Heim is concerned when he says that all we can do is to say Thou to God; we can never say anything adequate or objectively true about Him. Yet the faith of Christianity is that God has revealed Himself and can be known.

Now it is not without significance that virtually the same criticism of theological terminology which Bevan makes was expressed quite differently in Stuart Chase's *The Tyranny of Words*. There sociologists and psychologists, scientists and theologians are all taken to task for their subservience to what he calls "the tyranny of words." It is very properly suggested to all of us that we pin our words down to a real experience; that we stop reasoning with words; that in all our attempts at logical reasoning, we keep our words and ideas in close touch with reality, verifiable by experience. Certainly theologians need those suggestions; for in theology we are constantly mistaking the word for the thing, the symbol for the referent. We like to assume that a common tag refers to only one idea, one thing, one experience, when in different individuals' thought worlds, it may be attached to a hundred varying conceptions. We are too content to keep on using terms which are blanks to the modern mind—having no proper meaning at all. Again, we are guilty of playing with words and thoughts, arranging them in logical patterns without bringing them down to earth in the process and keeping them there; without being vividly conscious every moment we reason with them that

they refer to a specific reality and that our very reasoning has implications for the nature of that reality. Think of how much controversy and speculation would have been avoided and how much of the discussions of the past and present are rendered futile by the strict and conscientious application of this principle to the history of the ideas of—let us say “atonement” or “justification.”

At the best, words are very imperfect symbols by which we seek to communicate to others our experience and our thoughts about that experience. No matter how carefully chosen by the most meticulous and clear-minded thinkers, they remain inaccurate and inefficient symbols. Words are constantly changing in meaning. They derive their original meaning from some past and half-dead civilization; their present meaning from current usage. They become parts of differing systems of thought, from which they derive still newer meanings and implications which are henceforth associated with them. Moreover, every individual who uses these words gives to the same word a different shade of meaning. The result is that one of the real problems of thought—and theology is thought—is just this matter of terminology.

Occasionally there comes to my study a fellow-pastor, a Lutheran, a contemporary of mine, trained in the same institutions, with a somewhat similar home and congregational background and sufficiently like me in temperament to be a partner in an old friendship. Yet we cannot long discuss such simple ideas as “repentance” or “forgiveness” without repeatedly re-defining our terms. Every word used comes out of a personal background of temperament, experience, present mood, interests, education, current reading, environment, practical problems—which makes of every word a personal thing with a personal meaning. To assume that a word in the mouth of a friend is identical in meaning with the same word when I use it, would but invite and achieve confusion. We talk different languages—yet languages which happily can be grasped by each other, as long as we recognize the fact and make an effort to translate my words into his language and his into mine.

Now imagine our little circle of two enlarged to include men of more dissimilar temperaments, training, experience, back-

ground, etc. Include men of a different century, of other races and ecclesiastical loyalties—and soon we will have a group of theologians who simply do not understand each other. I say—not “cannot” but “do not.” For here is an element that will continue to divide the church long after there is any essential need for the church to be divided. There is tragedy in the fact that theologians do not seem to want to understand each other—even Lutheran theologians; that they will not study each other’s language sympathetically. We shudder to admit that, given a certain temperament, language, race, culture, environment, and heredity, living in the same age, facing the same problems, we might stand today with Barth but yesterday with Harnack.

Yet our traditional conservative treatment of the Bible is in sharp contrast to this attitude. For there we have been doing with enthusiasm that for which I have been pleading—so enthusiastically that at times we did violence to history. We have been eager in our study of the Scriptures to harmonize, to use “the analogy of faith,” to say of Paul and Peter and James and John that they worshiped and served and confessed one Christ in one common faith, but that this faith has found expression in differing words because they were different and their problems varied. We will not admit that there is what we elsewhere call heresy in the Bible. Nor are we eager to find it in the early church and her councils. But as we move forward in history toward our own times, we take a different attitude. We insist that Luther and Calvin and Thomas Aquinas have a different spirit and belong apart. Perhaps they do. But we may be too sure—considering that we speak languages the other does not understand; that we do not clearly define our terms; that we are not consistent in using one word in one and the same sense; that we oft reason with words instead of with the realities for which they stand; that we do not regularly interpret words in their historical context. We might some day be amazed to see who is of a different spirit; it might be not our Catholic neighbor, but the Lutheran pastor who sits by our side in some Ministerial Association.

Consider what our own Lutheran Confessions have to say in this matter. In the Epitome of the Formula of Concord we read that creeds and confessions of the church are to be regarded "only as a witness and a declaration of the faith, as how at any time the Holy Scriptures have been understood and explained in articles of controversy in the church of God by those who then lived and how the opposite dogmas were rejected and condemned."² That is the Formula's way of saying that the form or the words, of the creeds and confessions, and even more so of any theology based on them, is definitely dated. It is false or true only in its life-context. Out of that context it is simply not pertinent until translated into the language of a new life-context.

This is the principle behind the development of all critical and historical study of the Scriptures and theology. In recognizing that the words of the past dare never be removed from their historical context without being immediately and carefully translated into the context of today, it issues a call to the Confessional church to be confessional in the sense of producing confessions: to express our faith in words that have meaning for today; to meet modern points of controversy with terms as clear and simple and experientially verifiable as we can possibly secure; to keep recognizing the impermanence and imperfection and essentially symbolic nature of our modern words and Confessions. It is a part of our Confessional principle to keep producing declarations such as those authorized by the Washington and Baltimore Conventions.

But there is still another side of the matter to be stressed. This leads us to the central conviction which I wish to express. The Formula of Concord begins with the statement: "We believe, teach, and confess that the only rule and standard according to which at once all dogmas and teachers should be esteemed and judged are nothing less than the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testament."³ For obvious historical reasons, the Christian church has not been able to go behind the words of

2 *The Book of Concord*, ed. H. E. Jacobs, Vol. I, p. 492.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 491.

the Scriptures since these present the oldest records of the life and ministry of Jesus and the Gospel of the Christian church. There is little likelihood that this situation will be changed. The Word of God in Christ Jesus is spoken to us through the Bible. There is a sense, therefore, in which the very words of Scripture must be the standard, not in any legal way but because they provide the classic, original expression of the ideas and experiences and facts which go to make up the Christian faith. There is a sense in which the words of Scripture have always been the standard. For they have furnished not only the ideas and facts but also the very word-tools out of which countless theologies have been formed. They are the words which have been familiar to generations of Christian laymen, too—men who have lived in various ages and under different theologies, but who have read and heard expounded these same Scriptural expressions.

Now the very fact that the words of Scripture have had to bear to each generation a practical Christian message and at the same time be employed and fitted into the theology of the day, has meant that they have been twisted and turned into all kinds of shapes. Biblical theology has suffered thereby. Neither theologians nor preachers have been concerned to use these terms in their classic Scriptural sense. Every one has had an axe to grind—for rationalism or pietism, for orthodoxy or heresy, for philosophy or homiletics. Yet I can conceive of no new theology that would be more practical or more permanent in value than one which would retain the New Testament terms in their New Testament meanings—and retain all of them, not seeking to harmonize Paul and John, or Paul's words with John's words, but permitting Paul and John together to enrich Christian thought, relating Paul's terms and John's terms to God and Christ and man as spokes relate the hub of a wheel to its rim.

That figure is Deissmann's; and I believe it deserves more serious thought and consideration by theologians than they have accorded it. When someone plans and constructs a theology in which justification, sanctification, atonement, forgiveness, reconciliation, etc., not only retain their Scriptural meanings which are

relatively free from the philosophical implications later generations have found in them, but also are related not so much to each other as to God and Christ and man, and are recognized as symbolic, anthropomorphic expressions that describe various experiences of God in Christ, all of which are real and true, the result will be a theology that includes all the strands of Christian thought and life, one that will be richer and less sectarian than any of the so-called orthodox or heretical theologies of the past. Such a theology will recognize and make evident the true doctrinal unity of the whole Christian church and will serve to bring separate denominations into closer relationships. Such a theology will escape, as far as it is humanly possible, the "tyranny of words."

No one will deny the necessity for thought of relating systematically into some logical, orderly grouping the great religious convictions enshrined in the New Testament terms of "justification by faith," "salvation by grace," etc. No one will deny that there is a right intellectual relationship between justification and sanctification, Law and Gospel, etc. No one should deny that the Holy Spirit has been working within the church of the generations that have lived since New Testament days, adding to our understanding of the deep roots of the Gospel. But we must still remember that when we deal with these great New Testament terms and ideas, we deal not with pieces of a system of thought which can be put together to form some original divinely-given theology. We deal rather with flashes of religious experience, preserved in the most convenient, current word of the day. Theology will do its best work not by attempting to piece them together to form some intellectual closed-system, but by paralleling these words in order to witness vividly, appealingly, convincingly, richly to the individual religious experiences behind them. The matter of the logical relationships between them—a matter of speculation always—had better be left to the individual. For in the final analysis not only must every man form his own theology, but every man will.

This is why theology would do well to start with the New Testament terms for Christian ideas and experiences, since they are not only the common coin for Christian understanding between

laymen and theologians but also the product not of logic and philosophy but of different areas of common human experience. Alongside of these classic New Testament words and symbols need to be placed other ancient and modern terms which in various ages have served to interpret and call forth a parallel Christian experience—and all be grouped as spokes in a wheel. The more spokes, the better the chances of keeping in touch with the reality of human needs at every point. The aim of the theologian in formulating his new Dogmatic ought to be to approximate not the mathematical exactness and exclusiveness of the scientist but the richness and concreteness of the artist. In the past theologians have been far too sensitive to orthodoxy and heresy. Perhaps that is why modern laymen and preachers are often wholly indifferent to the distinction. The church has failed practically to recognize that the truth in false emphases and heretical ideas is needed and can be saved for Christian thought, if only the heretical idea is kept within the Christian tradition, and properly balanced by the so-called orthodox idea placed alongside.

Our own Confessions call us to a constant re-examination of our faith in the light of the need to keep “the Holy Scriptures alone the judge, rule, and standard according to which, as a test-stone, all dogmas should and must be discerned and judged as to whether they are good or evil, right or wrong.”⁴ Theoretically our Lutheran Confessionalists reiterate this view, writing: “We are faithful to the Lutheran Church because it is the church of Jesus Christ. If it becomes something else, if its teachings were something else than a correct exposition of the plain Word of God, it would no longer be our church. . . . It is not the Symbolical Books that count. If it should ever be demonstrated that their exposition of the Gospel is false, we would be the first ones to cast them into the fire.”⁵ But we ought to be more realistic and practical and open-minded in our study of our Confessions, in our comparing them with the Scriptural descriptions of our faith, and

4 *Ibid.*, p. 492.

5 Sasse, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

in our translating their meanings into modern terms. Dr. C. M. Jacobs in his lectures on the Confessions at the Philadelphia Seminary had been seeking to do this—and brilliantly too. But I believe a still sounder method would be to begin not with the Confessions but with the classic terms of the Scriptures. In so doing we may be able to enrich and correct our own Lutheran theology without finding it necessary to deny the truth and the importance of the emphases our own Lutheran Fathers made in days past. We may have to recognize that justification is only one spoke in the wheel of salvation. But we may also be able to insist more strongly than ever before that there is only one hub, faith—only one rim, love—only one axis, Christ.

IS HISTORY TRUSTWORTHY?

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

WE are accustomed to apply the word "history" to any record of events which we hold to be true. Before the Reformation the word was used more indiscriminately. It was employed to cover both what we now call "history" and what we generally understand by "fiction." No distinction was made at that time between stories which were conscious products of imagination and accounts which were intended to describe actual happenings. What we now call the "Fables of Aesop" were then called the "Histories of Aesop." But in the course of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries a distinction was made between history and myth. History, it was said, rests on facts; myth rests on fancy. This distinction was made more rigid in the nineteenth century when Leopold von Ranke defined the task of the historian as describing the past "as it actually was." Exacting methods of research were developed and historians went to work confidently believing that it was possible to discover and arrange facts in such a way as to produce a faithful picture of the past "as it actually was." From time to time the assumptions of historians were called into question, but no really serious attack was made on the validity of the historical method until our own generation. Today the line of demarcation between history and myth is threatening to vanish. History, we are being told, is essentially myth. We cannot know what actually happened in the past.

As Christians we cannot be indifferent to this skepticism about the record of history, for our faith is intimately bound up with a part of the past. We believe that something of fundamental importance to us actually happened in Palestine nineteen hundred years ago. The God in whom we believe is the God who revealed Himself then and there in the person of Jesus Christ.

In fact, we can say with Luther that "we know no other God" than the God who was seen in the face of Jesus Christ. He cannot be discovered by experimentation or speculation; He can be known only as He manifested Himself "once for all" in history. Our faith, therefore, rests on events, not on ideas. That "God is love" is an idea, but that "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son" is the interpretation of an event. It was with such events, with what had happened, that apostolic preaching was concerned. And we still acknowledge the supreme importance of these recorded events of history when we repeat the Apostles' Creed: Jesus was born, He suffered, He was crucified, dead, and buried, and He rose again from the dead.

There are also other parts of the past which are important to us as Christians. The experience of men and women down through the ages has been a constant witness to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Faith, Luther once said, "is a living, busy, active, mighty thing." Its creative power has never ceased. It has unfolded itself in the history of the church. It has been applied to every conceivable situation. It has altered customs, shaken institutions, and changed the face of the world. The varied testimony of nineteen centuries of Christian life is important to us in our understanding of Christianity. It is important to us, that is to say, if history is trustworthy.

Let us proceed for the moment on the assumption that we can know something about the past and ask how the new skeptical attitude toward history developed. The simplest answer would be that it is a symptom of our generation's climate of opinion, a symptom of that pervasive temper of the world which is marked by distrust and pessimism. But we would be doing scant justice to the honest doubts of our day if we were to leave the answer at that. Several reasons for the current pessimism concerning the trustworthiness of written history may be adduced.

In the first place, the tempo of the times has made men impatient with history. We are living in an age of swift and unpredictable change. Ever since the World War the world has been leaping from revolution to revolution, from crisis to crisis,

from reconstruction to reconstruction. There has been little inclination to consult precedent or tradition. And even when there has been a desire to do so, historiography has not been able to keep pace, in its revisions, with the rapid flow of events. The historian necessarily lags behind. He must feel today much like the Englishman Thomas Fuller felt when, in the similarly troubled times of the middle of the seventeenth century, he wrote in the preface to his *Church History of Britain* (1655): "An ingenious Gentleman some monthes since in Jest-earnest advised me to make hast with my History, for fear (saith he) lest the Church of England be ended before the History thereof." The history of inherited thought, life, and institutions is always more greatly esteemed in times of leisurely development than in times of tumultuous change. To the impatient man of today history seems to have little to say.

In the second place, the man in the street has become increasingly conscious of what the historian has long since known: that not all official statements are to be taken at face value. During the World War, and in the years which have followed, news reports have been read with growing suspicion. Brazen falsifications, subtle distortions, and even complete suppression of the truth have been exposed again and again. The use of controlled propaganda is generally recognized even if it is not always possible to detect readily when and how it is used. But awareness of the fact that truth is often twisted to mold popular opinion today has cast suspicion on the records of the past and the motives which might lie behind them. The admission on the part of historians that things are not always what they seem to be only confirms the impression that it is next to impossible to get at the truth.

In the third place, the historian is often himself bewildered by the tremendous task of assimilating the mass of material which has accumulated. For more than a century the repositories of great libraries have been filling up with manuscript documents. The presses of all lands have been disgorging thousands upon thousands of volumes of other sources. Countless historical journals and monographic studies have been calling attention to minute details of the past. And on top of all these gradually

accumulating sources and studies has come a veritable avalanche of new materials. In a frantic effort to avoid mental indigestion some historians have left the beaten track of plodding research and have sought new and easier methods of historiography. They have substituted intuition for painstaking analysis, or they have intimidated recalcitrant evidence by the application of superficial psychoanalysis, or they have been content to select only such testimonies from the past as suited their preconceived theses. Such short cuts through or across the chaotic mountains of materials have robbed the conclusions of credibility.

In the fourth place, the continued reflection by historians on the work in which they are engaged has led some of them to pessimism. It is true that there are many research scholars and compilers of textbooks in history who do not give much thought to what they are doing and why they are doing it the way they are. They proceed in a naive and uncritical acceptance of traditional methods without subjecting them to scrutiny. But there are others who are constantly re-examining the presuppositions on which historiography rests and are constantly testing the validity of old and new methods. Among these are some—often the most vocal—who have come to doubt whether we can really know anything about the past. It is not without significance that most of this skepticism has appeared where the accumulation of sources has been most bewildering, where suspicion about the credibility of news reports has been most acute, and where swift change has made men particularly impatient with the past. In Germany and Italy, and only to a slightly less extent in France and England, the trustworthiness of written history has been severely attacked. As for America, we might accept the judgment of the distinguished historian Charles A. Beard who said recently: "Upon American historical scholarship all this continental searching and exploring has had little effect. . . . It is not going far beyond the mark to say that European disturbances in thought will find their loudest echoes here after the lapse of thirty or forty years. If this conjecture is correct, then the problem [of historical knowledge] that disturbed Croce about 1912 may become insistent in the United

States about 1950.”¹ It may be possible that the *loudest* echoes will not shake us until 1950, but that there are already slight reverberations here is evident from Mr. Beard’s own adoption of a modified pessimism.

What, then, are the charges which are being leveled against the validity of historical knowledge? The charges are many and varied. Some of them are old and some of them are new. It would be neither possible nor profitable to attempt a discussion of all of them here. But the complex questions which have been raised can be reduced for our purpose to four major indictments.

The first indictment is that historiography is not scientific. This accusation would not be serious if it were not for its implications in a science-conscious age when the term “scientific” has acquired a connotation of exclusive trustworthiness. It does not matter to an historian whether his work is described as a science or an art. But he has reason to be concerned when the label “scientific” is withheld in disparagement of the validity of his conclusions.

It must be clear at the very outset that the object of study never determines whether or not the study is scientific. A flower might be an object of study both for a photographer and for a botanist. What makes the botanist’s study scientific and the photographer’s artistic is not the flower but the way in which the flower is approached. In other words, a study is scientific because of the method by which it is studied, not because of the contents of the subject. And whenever a trained technician makes accurate observations of his subject, draws rigorous inferences from these observations, and then states conclusions in terms which are accepted by other similarly trained men, he is said to be engaged

1 Charles A. Beard and Alfred Vagts, “Currents of Thought in Historiography,” in *The American Historical Review*, XLII (1937), pp. 464, 465. The writer has found the following works, in addition to those cited below, most useful in setting forth the skepticism of the post-war period: Ernst Troeltsch, *Der Historismus und seine Probleme* (Tübingen: 1922); Karl Heussi, *Die Krisis des Historismus* (Tübingen: 1932); Edward P. Cheyney, *Law in History and Other Essays* (New York: 1927); Charles A. Beard, “Written History as an Act of Faith,” *A.H.R.*, XXXIX (1934), pp. 219-229; Maurice Mandelbaum, *The Problem of Historical Knowledge* (New York: 1938).

in scientific work. An historian can with justice claim that he makes reasonably accurate observations and that he habitually exercises great caution in drawing inferences from them. The great body of written history also demonstrates that specialists have come from their independent investigations with essentially the same conclusions. Like a physician performing an autopsy, an historian examines the dead body of the past. And the method of neither can be called unscientific because false diagnoses are occasionally made.

There is a distinction, however, between what we call the social sciences and the natural sciences which must be observed. The historian deals with specific events which occur only once. The natural scientist, on the other hand, is interested solely in occurrences which take place repeatedly. It is the historian's purpose to describe unrepeatable events; it is the natural scientist's purpose to deduce laws from repeatable events. This distinction was brought out very clearly by Henri Poincaré when he wrote:² "Carlyle has written somewhere something like this. 'The fact alone matters: John Lackland has passed this spot. That is something to wonder at, a reality for which I would surrender all the theories in the world.' This is the language of the historian. The physicist would rather say, 'John Lackland passed this spot. That is nothing to me, since he will never pass this way again.' " The conclusion has sometimes been drawn that the inferences of physicists are more trustworthy because they can repeat their experiments frequently while an historian cannot. This is certainly true. And it deserves emphasis. Nevertheless it is also true that some historical events are actually attested by more witnesses than some experiments which are conducted in only a few laboratories. Certainly more persons can testify from personal observation that a new pope was crowned in Rome on March 12, 1939, than can testify from personal observation that it is possible to smash an atom.

² Quoted by H. G. Wood, *Christianity and the Nature of History* (Cambridge: 1934), p. 15.

Sometimes the accusation is also made that historians present their conclusions in less scientific form than natural scientists. There are many cases, it must be conceded, in which historians have allowed themselves to be carried away by their own eloquence. But such sacrifice of truth for the sake of rhetoric is not defended by members of the craft. There is no reason, however, why an historian should not employ every legitimate literary device to make his narrative as vivid and as interesting as the original event itself. Dullness is not a hallmark of science. The physicist cannot claim that there is more scientific virtue in his reports because they are uninteresting.

Is historiography scientific? Within the limitations which grow out of its subject matter it can claim to be just as scientific as the natural sciences.

A second indictment which is brought against historiography is that the historian imposes patterns on the past which were never really there. History, a recent critic puts it, is "making sense out of what is senseless."³ The story of the past is only "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing," until the historian distorts it by giving it meaning. It is a matter of common experience, we are told, that the present always seems chaotic. We are aware of isolated events, but we have no intimation concerning the direction which these events are taking. We find no pattern in what is happening about us. For example, we can only hazard the boldest kind of conjecture as to whether we are moving toward or away from Lutheran union in America. Our experience does not give us an answer. All we are really conscious of is a jumble of unrelated incidents. But some day, when the Lutheran Church in America is finally united, some historian will come along with a pretty pattern which will purport to show that we have all along been progressing more or less steadily toward the accomplished goal. In this way, we are told, the historian always imposes on the past a structure which was never actually there.

3 Theodor Lessing, *Geschichte als Sinngebung des Sinnlosen* (Leipzig: 1927).

At first glance this criticism seems to be well founded in our experience. But no more than a second glance is needed to reveal that it is unduly pessimistic. That one event has a direct and simple bearing on another is a matter of daily experience. We are spontaneously aware that there is a relation between a flash of lightning and a blazing church spire. We are equally aware of the relation which exists between the death of Pope Pius XI and the election of Pope Pius XII. So we are aware, too, that there is a real connection between the Savannah Resolution on church union (1934) and the recent agreement of the Commissions representing the United Lutheran Church and the American Lutheran Church. The historian does not have to invent these connections; they are given by the evidence which he analyzes. When he has made himself thoroughly acquainted with the data, events arrange themselves around a chosen subject in the mind of the historian almost as naturally as iron filings are attracted to a magnet. To be sure, imagination and intuition play a part in the historian's reconstruction of the strands of history. But they play a part, too, in the experimental laboratory of the most exacting natural scientist. In both cases, however, imagination and intuition are controlled and tested by the evidence itself.

But it may be objected, as indeed it has been, that contemporaneous evidence sometimes gives conflicting accounts of the connection of events. In such cases at least (so it is charged) the historian makes a selection, and this selection may result in the substitution of a false pattern of events for the real one. It is true that this possibility is always present. But careful analysis often reveals that conflicts in evidence are more apparent than real. To take an obvious example, the death of John Huss, who was burned at the stake in 1415, was brought about by heresy, according to a contemporary churchman; but according to a layman of the time it was caused by fire. This apparent conflict is of course resolved when the historian analyzes the two statements and discovers that the churchman was thinking of the sentence and the layman of the execution of the sentence. It is true that not all conflicts in evidence are so easily resolved. But the prin-

ciple is uniformly the same. The historian does not impose his own patterns on the past; the patterns are found in the past itself. The cautious procedure of the historian, which is constantly checked by his fellow-historians, gives reasonable assurance that the past is faithfully described in terms of its own evidence.

A third indictment against historiography, and one which is even more serious, is that every historian writes history to suit his own purposes. More than a century ago Goethe declared that "what the historian calls the spirit of the times is only his own spirit in which the times are mirrored." In our own day the Italian Benedetto Croce has charged that history is only "contemporary thought about the past."⁴ This view was carried to its ultimate conclusion recently by the American Carl Becker. "A myth," he writes,⁵ "is a once valid but now discarded version of the human story, as our now valid versions will in due course be relegated to the category of discarded myths. . . . Every generation, our own included, will, and must inevitably, understand the past and anticipate the future in the light of its own restricted experience, must inevitably play on the dead whatever tricks it finds necessary for its own piece of mind."

The historian's prejudices first emerge, we are told, when he selects a topic of study. His selection is made on the basis of his interest. A Roman Catholic historian might choose to treat the inquisition because he believes that it has been unjustly condemned and that he can contribute to its defense. A Protestant, on the other hand, might choose the same subject because he believes that he can uncover further damaging evidence against Rome. Even in the selection of a subject, therefore, there is always conscious or unconscious bias which colors the historian's narrative. That interest of one kind or another dictates the choice of a subject cannot be denied. We can take it for granted that an historian who is interested in the inquisition will naturally turn to its study. In this respect he is no different from a bio-chemist who has been

4 Benedetto Croce, *History, Its Theory and Practice*, translated from the Italian (New York: 1923).

5 Carl L. Becker, *Everyman His Own Historian* (New York: 1935), pp. 247-253.

led by his interest to engage in cancer research. The choice of subjects on the basis of interest is unavoidable and in itself not unwholesome.

It is charged however, that having selected his subject according to his interest, the historian inevitably injects his particular class prejudice or regional prejudice or cultural prejudice into his narrative. If he lives in a palace his interpretation will be different from that of a man who lives in a hut. If he is a Marxist his mind will be receptive to evidence of economic influences and blind to evidence of spiritual forces. In this way every historian will consciously or unconsciously select only such evidence as fits his own interest and arrange it in such a way as to satisfy his own prejudices. The only way in which we can get around this difficulty, we are told, is to read a history of the life and times of the historian whose work we are studying. For example, we must correct Professor Mann's *Life of Muhlenberg* by reading another work which describes the thought world in which Professor Mann lived. Suppose, for this purpose, we were to read Professor Spaeth's *Life of Dr. Mann*. But since Dr. Spaeth must also have written with a bias, we must turn to his wife's biography of Dr. Spaeth for further correction. There, however, we must stop without reaching a conclusion about Muhlenberg until someone produces an adequate account of Mrs. Spaeth and the conditions in which she lived. So we can never really know the past. All we can hope to have is perspectives of perspectives, subjective interpretations of subjective interpretations, a series of falsifications whose end we can never reach.

Of course, no one will deny that an historian normally has as many prejudices as anyone else. Nor can it be denied that he labors under greater temptation than a natural scientist to inject his prejudices into his conclusions. One must go even further and admit that there are many notorious cases of such distortion. The Orthodoxists of the seventeenth century pictured Luther as a rigid Orthodoxist; the Pietists in the early eighteenth century described him as a squeamish Pietist; and the Rationalists of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries made him out to be

a hard-headed Rationalist. The Englishman Froude wrote his *History of England* to expose the evils of the Roman Catholic Church and to discredit the clericalism in the Anglican Church. Ritschl approached his *History of Pietism* with a deep dislike for mystical piety and he used his history as a vehicle for his reproaches. But perhaps the most striking example of the injection of an historian's prejudice into his narrative is to be found in the writings of John Aylmer, later bishop of London, who wrote, in 1559, out of a heart full of bitterness toward the French: "Are they Giaunts, are they conquerours, or monarks of the world? No, good Englishe men, they be effeminate Frenchmen: Stoute in bragge, but nothing in dede. . . . When durst these meacockes mete us in the field? or if they did, went they not weepyng away? . . . We have a few hunting termes and pedlars French in the lousye lawe, brought in by the Normanes, yet remayning: but the language and customes bee Englyshe and Saxonyshe . . . We live in paradise. England is the paradise and not Italy, as commonly they call it."⁶ And in the margin Bishop Aylmer added, "God is English!"

But how are such examples of historiography esteemed? In any circle of modern scientific historians they are uniformly deplored. To spare the fair name of history's muse they are condemned to the inferno of propaganda. And observe the grounds on which they are condemned. Bishop Aylmer's work is not criticized on the ground that he was an Englishman, but on the ground that his statements are not supported by the evidence. Ritschl's work is not criticized on the ground that he hated Pietism, but on the ground that he sometimes went beyond his sources. In short, it is the ideal of the historian to hold his prejudices in check, at least while he is engaged in his professional task, and to allow himself to be controlled by the evidence. And that this ideal is not an impossible one is substantiated by the ever growing number of conclusions which stand the test of repeated investi-

6 Cited by C. L. McIlwain, "The Historian's Part in a Changing World," *A.H.R.*, XLII (1937), pp. 210, 211.

gation by countless men of every conceivable national, creedal, and cultural persuasion.

A fourth indictment which is brought against historiography is that the constant rewriting of history is in itself a demonstration of its untrustworthy character. History, said Goethe long ago, must be rewritten in every age. And Goethe was certainly right. In truth, it is a matter of actual fact that much of it *has* been rewritten in every age. Charles A. Beard recently asserted that if an historian could know what actually happened in the past, history would not need to be rewritten. "If the historian could do this [i.e. know the past], then so far as he covers the past there would be nothing left for posterity to do. The task of writing the history of countries and periods could be definitely discharged. To that extent students would have no work before them except that of reading the masters. A new historical treatment of an age would be as unthinkable as a new multiplication table."⁷

Mr. Beard is right when he asserts that the objectivity of the multiplication table can never be achieved by written history. And no historian would claim that he can reduce the past to such a refinement of abstraction. All that the historian claims to do is to present a description which corresponds with past actuality. And he uses precisely the same methods to discover past actuality which we use today to discover present actuality—the direct testimony of the senses. We cannot reject testimony from the past (provided the credibility of the witnesses is reasonably acceptable) without rejecting similar testimony from the present. We cannot deny that Jesus lived⁸ some 1900-odd years ago unless we are ready to deny that President Roosevelt is living today; for in both cases we rely upon credible reports of the direct observation of contemporaries. We cannot deny that the Muhlenberg Building was in existence ten years ago unless we are willing to deny that it exists

7 Charles A. Beard, "That Noble Dream," *A.H.R.*, XLI (1935), p. 76 n.

8 The necessity for meeting renewed assaults on the "historicity" of Jesus is reflected in such works as Maurice Goguel, *Jesus the Nazarene: Myth or History?* translated from the French by Frederick Stephens (New York: 1926), and H. G. Wood, *Did Christ Really Live?* (London: 1938).

today; for both statements rest on the direct testimony of the senses.

If history rests on such sure ground, why is history rewritten in every age? Why was it once believed that Luther returned from Rome in 1510 scandalized by the corruption which he had seen and resolved to reform the church? And why do historians insist today that Luther returned from his visit to Rome unshaken in his obedience to the medieval church? Not because historians are more generous or more tolerant today in their attitude toward Rome, not because of any shift in their prejudices, but because new sources have been uncovered, because the old sources have been re-examined in the light of the new, because more exacting methods have been applied to the sources, and because the conclusions of many investigators have been subjected again and again to candid mutual criticism. History is rewritten because the evidence demands it, just as the natural sciences are constantly revised to conform with new findings. It is true that the *whole* truth about the past is not known today. Nor will it ever be known. But this is the common limitation of all human knowledge. We cannot demand omniscience from an historian when we do not expect it from other mortals.

There is an old story about a classical scholar in Cambridge who was so disillusioned about the possibility of knowing the past that he gave up trying to understand Plato and contented himself with translating him. It will be clear from what I have said that I do not share such pessimism about the possibility of knowing the past. I believe that the study of Church History can yield an essentially trustworthy account of past actuality and that it can therefore contribute toward an understanding of our faith as it has unfolded itself in varied expressions through the centuries. Church History can discharge this function provided that the most rigorous methods of scientific historical criticism are utilized in the pursuit of truth and provided that the truth thus found is received and embraced.

Bildad the Shuhite spoke a word of wisdom when he counseled his friend, "Inquire, I pray thee, of the former age, and apply

thyself to that which their fathers have searched out; for we are but of yesterday, and know nothing, because our days upon earth are a shadow." In such a spirit of reverent humility toward the past—because we are but of yesterday and need to search out the past to give perspective and depth to our knowledge—I approach the history of the church.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE

EMIL E. FISCHER
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

THERE are three reasons why the doctrine of the real presence in the Eucharist deserves renewed consideration today. In the first place, there is a revival of interest in the subject in Europe. Perhaps it would be better to say that the revived interest in doctrinal theology in Europe is again being focused upon the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. This is to be expected; for it is in this doctrine that the true spirit and content of every doctrinal system comes to clearest expression and receives its final interpretation.

There are indications that this revived interest in doctrinal theology is communicating itself to our American Protestantism also. If so, it is possible that it will follow the same course here that it has been following in Europe and the need will be upon us, if we wish to have any part in the revival, to set forth and defend our doctrine of the real presence. There may be some virtue, therefore, in introducing a discussion of the doctrine, however fragmentary the introduction may be. It may at least start us thinking seriously again upon doctrinal subjects, and so arouse us out of the state of theological complacency into which we seem to have fallen.

The second reason for considering this doctrine is the interest which the subject itself deserves. In the Lutheranism of our own land it has not become a controversial subject. There seems to be unanimity so far as our doctrinal teaching is concerned. At least the formulas in which we have come to express the doctrine seem to be satisfactory formulas. But we are not immune in this country to the trend which, one gathers from various writers, has assumed disquieting proportions elsewhere—a trend toward indifference to the observance of the rite, or at least toward a

formalism in the manner of its observance. A sense of loyalty to the church or a feeling of pride in the number of communicants to be reported may suffice for a time to conceal the real situation. But where deep conviction concerning the meaning of the sacrament no longer exists, no artificial stimulus will suffice for long to inspire loyalty. Absence from the Lord's Table will grow more frequent and habitual.

There is no reason to believe that such a situation has actually developed with us, although the ratio of communing members to confirmed members has been falling slightly. The only safeguard against it, however, is an intelligent faith. Our people must know what the meaning of the Lord's Supper is. And should they presume to ask questions concerning it, they must be met frankly and sympathetically and answered with conviction. It is at this particular point that an incipient indifference to the spiritual life often manifests itself, and it is well that we be forewarned in order that we may also be forearmed.

There is a third reason which has prompted me to choose this subject. In the movement for church unity which is gaining headway, the pivotal subjects upon which interest will be concentrated will be the doctrines of the church, the ministry, and the sacraments. They are all three inseparably related. The Lutheran Church, if it is true to its tradition, will continue to maintain its doctrine of the real presence and find in it a cause for continued separation until unity in the faith on this particular point has been attained. But mere formulas will not suffice to convict or convert others. However distasteful religious controversies may be, they are bound to arise when discussions concerning the Lord's Supper are to the fore. And when they arise, there must be no equivocation. Details of doctrine which a common formula may leave obscure or unanswered must be brought out into the light, and the church which maintains the formula must be ready to answer the questions which it provokes.

It is with some of these details of doctrine that this paper is concerned. Each of them played a part in the intensive controversies which were waged about the sacrament in the days of the

Reformation and immediately afterward. But the conclusions which were arrived at then were not conclusive in some instances. They left the way open for alternate views within the formula in which the Lutheran Church came to express the doctrine. Should the need of an intensive discussion of the doctrine again arise, as is probable, this lack of complete unity within our own church would become evident and might prove embarrassing.

I

The points to which we desire to direct attention are three. The first concerns the *res sacramenti*, that which constitutes the substance of the sacrament. Is it the body and blood of Christ or is it the forgiving grace of God? Granted a doctrine of the real presence, are body and blood the ultimate gifts, or are they to be defined as themselves vehicles of something which accompanies them, is conveyed by them, and therefore may be separated from them, namely, the gift of heavenly grace in Christ?

The matter is involved in our definition of the sacrament. Luther, we know, made body and blood the gift to be received. His definition of the sacrament in the Small Catechism, which has become the popular definition, is that it is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the bread and wine, given unto us Christians to eat and to drink, as it was instituted by Christ Himself. In this definition attention is immediately riveted upon the body and blood of Christ; not upon the elements, not upon the action, not upon the forgiving grace of God; but upon the body and blood. These constitute the heavenly gift. They are the sacrament; for, according to the definition, the sacrament *is* the body and blood of Christ given us Christians to eat and to drink.

The difficulty, as we have already observed, is one that concerns the definition of the sacrament. The older dogmaticians overcame the difficulty by introducing a fourth constituent. In addition to the institution by Christ, the earthly element, and the heavenly gift, they specified a heavenly element, namely, the body and blood of Christ. This provided a definite place for the saving

grace of God in the sacrament, but only by the introduction of a constituent element which would differentiate the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in an essential way from the sacrament of Baptism. Dr. Jacobs in his *Summary of the Christian Faith* rules out the idea of a heavenly element, commenting that only inaccurate writers would introduce it. The heavenly gift, he asserts, is the forgiving grace of God, of which the body and blood which are communicated with the elements are the pledge and seal. With this statement we are in agreement, and it would be helpful if the idea which it embodies could be made to find a place in our definition of the sacrament. After all, it is as a means of grace that we regard the sacrament. Grace should therefore be indicated as the ultimate gift which it brings.

There is another problem created by making body and blood the *res sacramenti*. It arises in connection with the doctrine of the *manducatio indignorum*. Lutheranism maintains that by reason of the sacramental union, effected through the power of the Word, whoever receives the consecrated elements, receives therewith the body and blood of Christ. As a matter of fact, it makes this point the decisive test of the difference between a Calvinistic and a Lutheran conception of the real presence. If a Calvinist is asked, Do the unworthy receive anything substantial in the Lord's Supper besides bread and wine, he must necessarily answer, no. The Lutheran, however, will respond with an emphatic yes. The real presence is a presence created by the Word and not by the faith of the recipient. It is therefore also communicated to the unworthy. They indeed receive the body and blood of Christ, not however unto their salvation, but unto their condemnation.

It follows then that in order that the real benefits of the Lord's Supper may be appropriated, faith is necessary. Body and blood are given, to worthy and unworthy alike; faith alone can make one's own the promise of the remission of sin. "Whoever receives these words, 'Given and shed for you,'" Luther writes in the Large Catechism, "and believes that what they declare is true, has it. But whoever does not believe it, has nothing, as it is offered to him in vain, and he refuses to enjoy such a saving

good. The Treasure indeed is opened and is placed at everyone's door, yea, upon everyone's table, but it is necessary that you also take of it, and confidently regard it as the words give it you."¹

This confidence or trust in the Word is characteristically Lutheran. The real treasure in the Lord's Supper is made ours only through faith in the Word. What place then does the real presence of body and blood have in the sacrament? What function does it fulfill? In the Reformation controversies, Lutheran theologians accused their Reformed contemporaries of robbing the Lord's Supper of its true treasure by denying the doctrine of the substantial presence. However, in order to maintain the doctrine of the *manducatio indignorum*, it was necessary for them to separate this true treasure from the substantial presence of body and blood, and grant it only to those who believed in the Word. In doing so, they exposed themselves to the Reformed contention that the real presence did not then constitute the *res sacramenti*. The *res sacramenti* was the forgiving grace of God and could be received only through faith. It followed, therefore, according to the Reformed argument, that the Lutheran conception of a substantial presence could be dispensed with without losing any of the efficacy of the sacrament.

The answer to this argument may be approached from two different points of view. It may be answered simply by an appeal to the Scriptures. Lutheranism believes in the real presence because the Scriptures teach it. Whatever difficulties the doctrine presents to faith are of secondary consideration. Facts are not determined by the difficulties which they present. But difficulties are dealt with on the basis of indisputable facts. Calvin's doctrine of the real presence may make its appeal from the rational point of view, but what the judicious Hooker wrote concerning the mystery of the Incarnation may also be applied to the mystery of the real presence: "Because this divine mystery is more true than plain, divers having framed the same to their conceits or fancies are found in their expositions thereof more plain than

1 *Book of Concord*, Jacobs' translation, p. 480.

true.”² Not its appeal to reason, but its Scripturalness has always been characteristic of Lutheranism’s interpretation of doctrine. This is especially true of its doctrine of the Lord’s Supper. It does not ask, Is it necessary, but, Is it true? If it is true, faith will find an answer to difficulties.

But the other answer to the argument that the real presence can be dispensed with without losing any of the efficacy of the sacrament is even more effective. The doctrine of the real presence is made inevitably necessary by our doctrine of the person of Christ, and our doctrine of the person of Christ is indissolubly associated with our conception of the Gospel.

According to our Lutheran conception, the divine and human natures of Christ are inseparable. Where the divine is, the human is also, the latter being transfigured by the former and thus enabled to participate in its attributes. This doctrine rests upon the reality and abiding character of the Incarnation. It is not the invention of expediency, as has been maintained, in order to make possible the doctrine of a real presence in the Lord’s Supper. The opposite is the fact. The doctrine of the presence of Christ according to His human as well as divine nature follows inevitably upon the doctrine of the Incarnation. Wherever Christ is, He is present in the completeness of His personality.

The Lutheran doctrine of the Lord’s Supper is therefore both a consequence of the doctrine of the Incarnation and a perpetual testimony to it. Sasse’s comments on this relationship are illuminating. “The rejection,” he writes, “by Luther and the Lutheran Church of Zwingli’s and Calvin’s teachings concerning the sacrament can be understood only in the light of their consequences: these teachings must inevitably, although certainly against the will of those who represent them, eventuate in undermining belief in the Incarnation and particularly belief in the presence of Christ. A spiritualism which will have nothing to do with Christ’s humanity, and concerns itself, instead, solely with His divine nature, will soon lose even this. The separation of the divine and

2 Quoted in Gore’s *The Body of Christ*, p. 155.

human natures of the Lord in such a way that one is thought of apart from the other, will easily result in the rejection of the doctrine of the two natures as an absurdity and in a complete abandonment of belief in the Incarnation. To what extent this opinion has been confirmed by the doctrinal development in Reformed Protestantism we shall refrain from judging. But within Lutheranism, at least, it is true that every defection from belief in the real presence of the whole Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar has resulted in an abandonment of belief in the Incarnation of the eternal Son of God."³

And as faith in a real Incarnation has grown weak, so has faith in the Gospel. For the Gospel is the message of the presence in the world of a gracious God for the world's redemption. In it God offers Himself in the incarnate Christ to men. To the extent to which that offer is accepted as real is certainty created in the heart. In the Lord's Supper, in which God offers us His grace accompanied by pledges and seals than which He Himself could provide none greater or more convincing, the Gospel reaches its climax. All that is promised in the Word is here given in the gift of Christ Himself, the whole Christ, who died for our sins and rose again for our justification. This is the assurance which is ours in the doctrine of the real presence.

But to return to the Lutheran idea of the *res sacramenti*. It is neither body and blood divorced from the Word, nor the Word divorced from body and blood. It is the Word, conveying grace through the gift of the body and blood of Christ.

II

The second point to which we desire to draw attention is the part which the Word plays in the sacrament. It is not unrelated to the point which we have already considered, but it raises problems which deserve separate treatment.

According to the accepted Lutheran view, the Word in the sacrament is exalted to a place of primary importance. Not only

3 *Here We Stand*, pp. 147-8.

would there be no sacrament without the Word, but, next to the bodily eating and drinking, faith in the Word constitutes the chief thing in the sacrament. To this Word Luther attributed a three-fold function: it was creative of the sacramental presence of Christ; it was illuminative of the true content of the sacrament; and it was communicative of this content to the recipient.

This analysis appears at first glance to set forth the relation of the Word to the sacrament in such a clear way as to preclude the appearance of any problem in connection with it. It seems to answer the questions which we are loath to ask but which unavoidably arise in any consideration of a doctrine of a substantial presence, questions of how and when and where. The question how? is easily disposed of by faith. It is the Word of promise that we rely on in the sacrament. As Christ has promised, so He will fulfill. His Word cannot be broken. Beyond that we cannot go. Less than that we cannot believe.

But the questions of when? and where? are not so easily disposed of. Does the real presence occur at the time of the consecration of the elements? Does it then move with the elements as these are communicated through the hand of the minister, so that it is actually communicated through the mouth, even to the unbeliever? If so, what becomes of the Word which is the chief thing in the sacrament? Is it not thereby removed out of the primary place which it should occupy and given a position subordinate to the substantial presence of body and blood?

About these questions intense controversies revolved and their effect has not yet been overcome. They raised new questions to which Lutherans have not been able to give a unanimous answer. There can be no doubt that Luther taught a sacramental union so intimate as to leave an impression of a local presence. Whether he actually held to such a view or was driven in the heat of controversy to use expressions which could be so interpreted may be a matter of opinion. In his calmer moments he would have repudiated the idea of a local presence. Nevertheless, it became a matter of serious concern with Melancthon that Luther's doctrine should not be so interpreted. He refused to incorporate the formula of

"in, with, and under" in the statement of the doctrine in the Augsburg Confession, and in his own discussions he used a simple "cum" to express the sacramental union. With the bread and wine we receive the body and blood of Christ.

Dr. Stump in *The Christian Faith* adopts this formula in preference to the "in, with, and under" formula. It is decidedly to be preferred. It preserves the fact of the sacramental union but avoids at the same time the implication of a local presence. Dr. Jacobs in his *Summary* clarifies the point still further by restricting the true presence of Christ to the moment of reception. In his answer to the question, What is the reception? he uses these words: "Christ gives no assurance of any special presence of His body and blood with the consecrated (elements) except in the eating and drinking. It is only in the culmination of this sacramental action that the sacrament actually occurs."⁴

This also throws light upon the relation of the Word to the sacrament. What the unbelieving reject is not the body and blood of Christ. These are truly communicated to them through the power of the Word. What they reject is the promise in the Word, "given and shed for you for the remission of sins." As the Formula of Concord expresses it, "they repel Christ from themselves as a Saviour, yet they must admit him even against their will as a strict Judge, who is present also to exercise and render judgment upon impenitent guests, as well as to work life and consolation in the hearts of the truly believing and worthy."⁵ The primacy of the Word is thus preserved. At no place in the sacrament is it allowed to recede into the background. Only as the Word is added to the whole sacramental action does the sacrament become a sacrament, a means of grace, truly offered, but to be worthily received only through faith.

III

There is a third point in the doctrine which needs elucidation. It enters so intimately into the whole subject that it has been diffi-

4 Page 368.

5 *Book of Concord*, p. 513, Jacobs' translation.

cult to avoid it thus far. It concerns the interpretation which we are to give to the expressions "body" and "blood." What is it that we receive according to our doctrine of a substantial presence of the body and blood of Christ? I realize that even to ask the question exposes one to the charge of trying to rationalize what can be accepted only in faith. This is my body; this is the blood of the New Testament—these indicate what we receive, and with this plain assertion we are to be content.

But it is not necessarily an evidence of lack of faith to ask questions. The asking may proceed out of faith itself; out of an earnest desire to realize as fully as possible the meaning of the gift which faith apprehends. Moreover, the words themselves admit of different interpretations and have been given different interpretations. They therefore present to the mind, even within the doctrine of a real substantial presence, alternate views which make a choice necessary. To seek to avoid this fact by dogmatic assertion without attempt at elucidation may be interpreted as an attempt to find refuge in obscurantism.

Luther's view, which is the one that has passed over into the Lutheran Church to a large extent is this: the body which is distributed in the Lord's Supper is the body of Him who hung upon the Cross. The blood is the blood which flowed in His veins. It was through the body that Christ earned our salvation. His body was the price which he paid for our ransom. It is this same body, now glorified, that is communicated to us, and which, through its communication to us, provides us with the assurance of our salvation. For with the body all the merits of Christ's atoning death become ours, inasmuch as it is the body of the Logos, of the Second Person of the Trinity, from whom it is never separated. By reason of the communication of attributes from the divine to the human nature, its communication to us in the Lord's Supper is made possible. The body of our Lord is sacramentally present when and where it pleases Him.

The significant factor in this view is the fact that it conceives of the body and blood as separated from the whole person. Body and blood thus become, to use Melancthon's phrase, a *res animata*,

or as it has been elsewhere expressed, a *massa humanae naturae*, a mass or lump of the human nature of Christ.⁶ This is hardly an adequate representation of Luther's idea. "The body of Christ," he wrote in the Large Catechism, "can never be an unfruitful, vain thing, without efficacy and benefit." Yet it is hard to avoid the impression of an impersonal reality working efficaciously upon a person. Only if faith is permitted to create the reality of the person whose body and blood are communicated is the free agency of Christ preserved. But to allow faith to create the presence of the real Christ would constitute a virtual surrender of the Lutheran view to the Calvinistic view, which Melancthon is actually accused of having made in his later years.

The alternate view is to conceive of the presence of the substantial body of Christ in terms of the *totus Christus*, of the whole Christ, according to His divine and human nature, with all His merits as Mediator. In the Apology, this view has found definite expression. At the conclusion of the discussion of Article X of the Augsburg Confession, these significant words are added: "And we speak of the presence of the living Christ, knowing that death hath no more dominion over Him."⁷ The German is even more explicit: *Wir reden von der Gegenwart des lebendigen Leibes*. There is nothing in this interpretation which requires the sacrifice of any essential part of our Lutheran doctrine. On the contrary, it truly discloses the sublime and ineffable gift which is offered us in the sacrament. It is the living Christ Himself who comes to us in all humility. "Therefore, whoso eateth of this Bread and drinketh of this Cup, firmly believing the words of Christ, dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him, and hath eternal life."

With this assurance we may depart from the Lord's Table. The crucified but living Christ has imparted Himself to us. There is a solemnity about that thought which should make participation in the Lord's Supper the most worshipful act in which the Chris-

6 Quoted in Gollwitzer, *Coena Domini*, p. 63.

7 *Op. cit.*, p. 175.

tian can engage. There is an assurance in it which should be the source of an inexhaustible comfort. There is a reality about it which should transfigure life. Where it is so apprehended there is little likelihood that the privilege which it offers will be neglected or its necessity minimized. It will then be recognized as the gift in which God gathers up all lesser gifts, and the pledge in which He gathers up all other pledges, and in one supreme act, offers His redeeming and sanctifying grace to the children of men.

THE SENSE OF THE SACRED¹

JOHN ABERLY

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

“Put off thy shoes from off thy feet for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground” (Ex. 3:5; Acts 7:33).

THIS Scripture was quoted by the first Christian martyr in his defence, and has been poetically paraphrased and extended by Elizabeth Barrett Browning—a liberty granted not only to poets but also to preachers:

Earth's crammed with heaven and every common bush afire with God;
And only he who sees takes off his shoes;
The rest sit round it and pluck blackberries.

The Old Testament is full of texts that stir the imagination. Recall the setting of this one. A young man, for so we will call him as he is just being called to his life's work, had years before qualified for his degree, being, as Stephen put it, learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. An uncontrolled zeal for justice for an oppressed people led him to a rash act that forced him into banishment to the desert—where, educationists tell us in our day, we spend altogether too little time in our preparation for life's work. And now after this long course of preparation both in the schools and in solitude, the spark came from above that was to release and direct the potencies stored up in that time of waiting that would make him a Leader and Lawgiver to his time and to all subsequent ages. And that spark, needed by him, was nothing other than that pointed to in the text—the sense of the sacred, the spirit of holiness. And as your Alma Mater has done me the honor to delegate me to speak a final word of counsel to you who now stand where that young man then stood, I wonder whether

¹ Baccalaureate Sermon, Gettysburg College, June 1936.

it could be expressed better than that you should take with you into your life something that for you has the sanctity that for it you are willing to wait and work, to suffer and sacrifice, to spend and be spent, to live and, if need be, die. I feel confident that with the felicitations of your parents who have sacrificed for you and whose hopes are centered on you, and of your friends whose good wishes are showered on you, goes the prayer that this may be for you a day of dedication to such a high and holy sense of mission.

It may inspire you to make such dedication if you remind yourselves of the essential place that the sense of the sacred has had in all human achievement. John Oman, one of the great philosophers of our day, makes the arresting statement that man began his upward march when he first learned to say, "No." It was the first step in that self-denial which turned man from following impulse to something higher, and that higher made its appeal to him because of its sanctity. Take the Decalogue as an illustration. Its precepts often seem too negative, but each one rests on a principle of something sacred. Fundamentally (and man can never get away from it, much as he tries) God is holy—thou shalt *not* worship or bow down to any other. His name is holy—do *not* profane it. His day is holy—do *not* pursue your ordinary avocations on it. Authority is sacred—honor thy father and thy mother. Life is sacred—do *not* kill; the home is sacred—do *not* sin against it; property is sacred—do *not* steal; a man's good name is sacred—do *not* defame or besmirch it. And, lest you should run the risk of breaking these fundamental sanctities, do not even harbor the desire for them—do *not* covet. In other words, draw not nigh hither; the place whereon men have had to stand to develop and strengthen their ethical life is holy ground.

But let us extend our view to other areas of life. The good life should be the chief goal of our efforts but it is not the whole of life. As educated men, I have no doubt that you often feel like protesting against the kind of preaching that harps only on this one subject. Culture, which is what a liberal education

stands for, wants the beautiful as well. It took our pragmatic philosophy of the West to add also the useful, even though men have always acted on it. And all of these and all the large areas of knowledge call for loyalty to the true. Let us remind ourselves that all of these take us back in their origin and forward for their highest expression to this sense of the sacred. What is it that has made Greek art the unsurpassed model of the ages? Was it not that they tried to give expression in art to the God-like? The art of the Middle Ages was inspired by the sense of the sacred—how to give expression to God incarnate, whether in the Sacred Infancy, or in the Transfiguration and Resurrection or in the Passion and Suffering of the Son of God. The great Oratorios were inspired by the same lofty themes. And literature—did not Dr. Luccock tell us only recently that Jack London had said that even a novel needs eternity as its background? Every great epic be it of Homer, or Valmiki, or Vergil, or Milton—all the great dramas and tragedies—take the sense of the sacred out of them and you have taken out of them that on which their greatness as works of art rests. Rome gave us law, and in our day of lawlessness would that we could recover some of that sanctity with which they invested it! But let it not be forgotten that Justice with them, and every other civic and domestic virtue, was a goddess. The Reformation in Europe began in an insistence on the sanctity of the individual and his conscience. It inspired the great No, “I can not do otherwise,” which reverberated throughout Europe and still is the great inspiration for all who stand for individual rights. In reading the Life of Abraham Lincoln one is impressed, as he was, with his limited opportunities but no less with the profound veneration he had for the framers of our Government and the sanctity of the Union. It is this that made him the man he was. And then one who makes no professions to be a scientist may yet be permitted to point to their reverence for truth that partakes of the sacred. Huxley’s statement that he who is not converted and become as a child can not enter the kingdom of science is an illustration of it. And this search for truth as something sacred is heightened when it is

joined to service for man whom that truth is to liberate. Major Ronald Ross, later Colonel Ross, was both poet and scientist. The Government of India set him apart to investigate the cause of malaria, which, with yellow fever, had been taking a toll of millions annually. In his poem "Indian Fevers" written 1890-93, he states the problem as a religious one:

The painful faces ask, can we not cure?
We answer, no, not yet; we seek the laws.
O God reveal thro all this thing obscure
The unseen, small, but million murdering cause.

And after August 20, 1897, when he had found the cause he again wrote a poem which may be called his hymn of Thanksgiving:

This day relenting God
Hath placed within my hand
A wondrous thing; and God
Be praised; at His command.

Seeking His secret deeds
With tears and toiling breath
I find thy cunning seeds
O million-murdering death.

Not when we wait the word
The word of God is given
The voice of God is heard
As much from earth as heaven.

But for his work the Panama Canal might not have been built. And he did his work, one may say, on his knees.

With such a cloud of witnesses about us, may we not with a deeper meaning say that every bush is afire with God? We need to cultivate and to consecrate ourselves to something that is sacred.

I had planned to go into detail and discuss the waning sense of the sacred in our time. I shall but mention what seem to be the causes and let you fill in details or even add others. The first cause is merely thoughtlessness—indifference—due in large part

to our absorption in things of sense. The senses always make an appeal stronger than that of the spiritual imagination. Among the nobler of these absorptions let us put a certain kind of scientific pursuit that finds itself in so interesting a world that it does not take time to contemplate these sanctities. Charles Darwin himself may be cited as an illustration of this. Then there is a second great cause. I shall call it disillusionment. It was this that disturbed you as students as you got into the larger world of thought when the old symbols of the sacred no longer had any force for you. Let us remember that the sense of the sacred has always had to express itself in symbols. Is not this what is at the basis of idol worship, of myth-making? And let us be honest, we still have our idols and make our myths. But the old ones we have shown the door and call superstitions. And then when we have found the symbol meaningless, we have only too frequently thought that the holy or sacred which it expressed for its day and age also was outmoded. I sometimes think that there is no one so in danger of narrowness as the student who asserts his freedom. On the basis of a religious man who is a hypocrite some would scrap all religion. Because of a dogma that no longer makes an appeal to a young man, he throws overboard the sense of the sacred and lives on an entirely secular plane.

But I must hasten on to state, and briefly to defend the statement, that there never was a time when there was greater need of this sense of the sacred nor any that offered larger opportunities for discovering and applying it than you are faced with at the present.

Never was there greater need. We are suffering from many ills, individually, socially, politically, internationally. I shall not attempt to enumerate them. I submit for your consideration, however, whether our supreme need is not that we return to life's simple and fundamental sanctities—the sacredness of life, the sanctity of law, the respect for home, for property, for reputation, for honor—why equivocate, for God. An old prophet long ago said, "In returning shall rest be found." We have thought we could work it out along the lines of greed and selfishness, and so

shame and confusion has covered the face of nations as it is at this day.

And yet the need is just as great for what John calls a discerning of spirits. There are false appeals, wrong standards, anti-Christians who try to usurp the throne of the real sacred in our day: the extreme individualism that makes its interests supreme, the nationalism that worships, be it the machine before which it bows and says, "These by thy gods that are to bring thee out of the house of bondage," or before the blood, race and culture of a people which alone are thought worthy of reverence no matter at what cost to the rest of the world. Two things must be eliminated if we are to get a true sense of the sacred. The one is selfishness; the other is sacrificing the good of the whole for the sake of a supposed good of any part. I can but hint at these. But whether you look at the secularism that banishes from its thought all sense of the sacred or at the rival gods that call for our worship, is it not true that there never was a time when the need for a right sense of the sacred was greater than that in which we are now living?

But over against that let us notice, as those who are in touch with what men are doing in the world of research and thought, that there never has been a time when the sacred impinged on us in a way so overpowering as just the present. When Pope composed his hymn of Creation what a limited universe he adored—the sun, the earth, the planets, the stars! Its dimensions have been extended until it is not too much to say that they stretch out to infinity. The astronomical spaces that can be but feebly expressed in millions of light years, the harmony of spheres and galaxies that give evidence, as Millikan expressed it, of a Creator who is always on the job—who can contemplate such a universe and not feel he is on holy ground! Strange perversity that leads men to feel that in such an order one dwindles into insignificance or is crushed altogether. What a truer view the Psalmist had: "When I consider thy heavens" (Ps. 8). Some one has said it takes more than a little plot of earth to make a lily. It certainly took all the forces of the universe to make us what we are. And if we will but learn to cooperate with these forces instead of being crushed

by them they will bear us up so that we may mount on wings as eagles to those heights to which an order so majestic can lift us.

The same truth is impressed on us as we think not of infinite spaces but of no less infinite stretches of time. The time was, and that not so many years ago, when here too the outlook was exceedingly circumscribed. Now we look back to millions upon millions of years to which we are heirs. And yet this thought too must be set over against the fact that the insect and the elephant have just as ancient a heritage. Some would turn to this to belittle man for, say they, are we not just like the beasts that perish? Is not all, they say, just the result of the working of blind forces which by chance have produced all these, and will just as inevitably work for their extinction? Is not this the reason for not a little of the cynicism of our time—that sees only the futility of things as they are and has no larger hope than that all our sanctities and all our values will be buried in the end under a universe in ruins. This is one of the miracles of unbelief. Believe it who can—it seems utterly incredible that an order as wondrous as we are in should work out absolutely nothing. Long ago the Hindu made himself believe that and it is the home of a philosophy of pessimism. I wish we might take the more hopeful and therefore saner view that the late J. Y. Simpson gives us in his last lectures, “The Garment of the Living God.” He would see in the nature that has been said to be red in tooth and claw, in the long struggle for existence, the toil and sacrifice that countless generations of life have had to make, an order that man, made in the image of God, might be evolved. We have just celebrated Memorial Day. To me the most sacred thing about all our blessings is that they have been purchased and preserved through the sacrifice—often the supreme sacrifice—of others to whom life was just as precious as it is to us. For

Life evenmore is fed on death
In earth and sea and sky
And that a rose may breathe its breath
Something must die.

With what profound sacredness should not the fact that our stage of development has been reached through countless ages of sacrifice invest our life! And what a call this to put life to none but the noblest of uses!

Just recently Albert Schweitzer in his Gifford Lectures gives us his philosophy in brief form. He calls it the "Ethics of the Reverence for Life." He takes us into his confidence and tells us that it was while sailing up one of Africa's rivers at the Edge of the Primeval Forest where he established his hospital for natives of the Dark Continent, with all the luxuriant life, vegetable, animal, human, about him, that the truth flashed on him that in reverence for life can be found the principle that, if applied, would usher in a new world order. Think it through with him, and I believe that life's sanctity, if believed and acted on, would do more than all our laws and regulations to give us the redemption from ills for which the creation is still groaning and travailing in pain.

But we turn to man himself and his history to find the sense of the sacred, the clue to all that is best and noblest in his development. The whole world of values, even the worth of life itself, rests on it. Until you understand man's religious strivings you have not understood man. Religion takes that abstract sacred and clothes it in forms fitted to our need. It has been said of the Christian Religion that it has found its chief sanctities in a Sacred Day—a Sacred Book—a Sacred Person. The same might however, also be said of Judaism, of Islam and, with slight modification, of Buddhism. So here too there must be a discerning of spirits. If life's highest is to be found in the sacred, and if the sacred is supremely manifested in Christ, as all admit, what a call this is for fellowship with the Lord Jesus, in spirit, in service—the very incarnation of Love and Purity, God manifest in the flesh.

One final thought: I believe that you will be helped if you remember always that you are entering on an order that is still in the making. The world of meaning, of values, the spiritual order will always be one in the making. It can not be handed to you ready-made. The sense of the sacred calls for appreciation of what it is, it calls for your consecration and loyalty, it calls for

your cooperation in making it a reality in your own life and in the day in which you live. Combine with your knowledge which you have received, and to which may you ever be adding, a deep sense of life's sanctities.

Let knowledge grow from more to more
But more of reverence in us dwell
That mind and heart according well
May make one music as before—
But vaster.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION TOMORROW¹

RALPH D. HEIM

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

THE "History of Gettysburg Seminary," prepared as a feature of the centennial celebration in 1926, presents the record of the Department of Religious Education and English Bible as follows:

In 1925 an entirely new department was created and a sixth professor added to the faculty. For some years there had been a demand from the constituency of the Seminary for more instruction in analytical English Bible. An effort had been made to meet that demand by introducing such a course covering one hour a week for each class. With the growing importance of the Sunday School and the sudden interest in weekday religious education and Daily Vacation Bible Schools, the demand arose that our ministers be equipped to act as intelligent leaders in the educational programs of the churches and of the Church. Accordingly, on the initiative of the Directors in 1924, it was determined to establish a Department of Religious Education and English Bible. This, it was felt, would not only place the Seminary abreast of the times in its curriculum but would also furnish much needed relief to the over-crowded Department of Practical Theology. The new Professorship was named the East Pennsylvania Synod Professorship of Religious Education and English Bible. As the first incumbent of the new chair the Seminary called the Rev. M. Hadwin Fischer, Ph.D.

To don the armor of that first active and gracious head of this department, and to seek with him to realize the vision of those who established the department, would be a heavy responsibility at any time. The responsibility becomes grave in view of the challenge which appears when the thoughtful observer considers "religious education tomorrow."

TOMORROW

To be sure, the nature of tomorrow's world is very uncertain. On the morning when these lines were written first, the newspaper headlines blazed forth: "Britain on War Rule," "Paris Citizens

¹ Inaugural Address as East Pennsylvania Synod Professor of English Bible and Religious Education in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., Sept. 28, 1939.

Ordered to Flee." Since that time, the terrible storm, so long awaited, has broken. Now the wisest in the land admit that they do not know what is ahead.

We do seem to be standing at the end of an epoch; we surely face something different. Is this, our day, the eve before a new Dark Age? But only a few years ago we thought it the dawn of a new era! And I, somehow, cannot give up those dreams. I find myself believing against reason that sunrise is not so far from nightfall. The dictators yet will meet their Gettysburg.

THE NEED

Whether, however, that world of tomorrow be good or bad, there will be need for religious education. It is enough to consider the more immediate future.

Two University of Michigan professors, Shorling and McClusky, have written an interesting book on *Education and Social Trends*, a book which starts one thinking about an equally interesting and still more vital topic, *Religious Education and Social Trends*. The professors discuss eleven prospective social and economic developments which public education should endeavor to control before they get entirely out of hand. On six of those trends religious education can speak.

On that which the authors term "the widening gap between our wants and our ability to satisfy them," Paul beseeches: "I have learned in whatsoever state I am, therein to be content."

On "the concentration of economic control without a corresponding acceptance of social responsibility," we hear Jesus' striking reply to the question, "Who is my neighbor?"

On "the weakening of the controls for the integration of personality exercised by religion and the home," the Ten Commandments speak powerfully.

On "the increasing complexity and strain of modern life to which the individual must adjust," there is the potent message of the Sermon on the Mount.

On "the struggle for international cooperation," there are Isaiah's and Micah's alluring visions of a warless world.

On "the clash of world political ideals," Jesus brings his ringing declaration: "Render unto Caesar . . . and unto God. . ."

Thus, on each of those significant trends which threaten ere-long to determine our social setting religious education can speak. And, if it does not speak all the other voices in the wilderness will be but empty sounds. For that and other reasons, even better reasons, tomorrow's world will need religious education. We have not fully outgrown those words of Luther after his visitation of the Churches:

Oh, how badly we treat these young people that are entrusted to us for discipline and instruction and a heavy reckoning shall we have to give for it that we keep them from the Word of God. We do not perceive all this misery, how the young people are being corrupted in the midst of Christendom, all for want of the Gospel, which we should always read and study with them.

So Luther wrote of the sixteenth century. We do better in the twentieth century. In our total educational program we have our tens of thousands of pulpits where educational sermons are preached. We have thirty-thousand Sunday schools with thirty million pupils and three million teachers. We have young people's societies, catechetical classes, Weekday and Vacation Church Schools, clubs, camps, and leadership schools. We have hundreds of colleges. We have scores of seminaries.

But there is more yet to be done in tomorrow's world. There is more to be done in the total educational program of the church as just described. There is more to be done in the field to which this department is more particularly devoted. Here there is need for a more extensive program. The program of "religious education tomorrow" must be larger in reach and in scope.

EXTENSION

We have had many statistics in recent years, some of them confusing if not conflicting. Out of them all, however, we may be certain of two things: our program of religious education is but slowly reaching larger numbers, and we have a boundless missionary opportunity.

We have reliable data on the first of these facts. The Sunday school at large is losing members although, in the United Lutheran Church, the curve took an upward turn in 1938. Membership in certain types of Weekday Church Schools is decreasing, while it is increasing in others. The total is some hundred of thousands. Young People's Societies and Vacation Church Schools are growing. The former reach more than a million, the latter nearly two million pupils. The entire situation with regard to enrollments is far from satisfactory.

On the matter of our opportunity, a little computation brings its significance home. Let us say that we should be unreasonable if we expected every American citizen to attend Sunday school on a Sunday morning. It would not be unreasonable, surely, to have as our goal one-half the population attending Sunday school. But that would require that we multiply all our existing figures by three! To care for one-half the population in Sunday schools would require three times the present membership, leaders, equipment, and units.

Similar facts appear when we study the scope of our religious educational program. It is probably correct to say that, when all allowances have been made, Christians are having as an average not more than an hour per week of religious education. There is no need for elaborate tests and measurements to know that that is not sufficient, particularly for the young. The amazing thing about it all is the abundant evidence of God's grace resting upon the church in that so much is accomplished in so little time.

The church has been awake to the situation. The fact, now so starkly evident as we reap the harvest of crime and irreligion in our area, became apparent early, namely, that the Sunday school unaided is inadequate to the task of providing sufficient religious training. Earnest leaders thereupon began to devise and promote auxiliary agencies which might serve as allies in the cause. More than fifty years ago the first young people's society was established. Later came the club and camp movement. Finally, the Daily Vaca-

tion and Weekday Church Schools were inaugurated. Nevertheless these all together, despite their wholesome service to those whom they have reached, are but a good beginning.

Thus, just as a goal for the reach of the program might well be the three-fold multiplication of numbers, so also an objective with regard to its scope might well be three hours, instead of one hour, for each of our people.

EFFECTIVENESS

Again, there is need for a more effective program of religious education. Unfortunately some reflection upon the past is always involved when we speak of a better future. This is regrettable, but unavoidable. Let us therefore pause to recognize our debt of gratitude and pay our tribute of appreciation to the unselfish labors of a host of saints. Then let us frankly and fearlessly recognize the demand for better things.

We need a finer technique and improved instruments, more effective materials and methods. As examples emphasizing that need we might consider the situation with regard to services of worship in the typical Church School or the Biblical information of the usual Christian. Let us, however, take for consideration something that is more important still. This appears in the statement of a young woman, not a Christian, who had taken a Christian college course in New Testament. She wrote:

My religion does not accept Jesus Christ. Through this study of the Life of Christ . . . I am being shown that the Christian religion has a sound basis and that it is a fine religion. The people of this world should be justly ashamed of their life, for they have at their disposal—to follow if they will—a creed that would release them from their bondage to evil, corruption, and bigotry. But you see, if the course has pointed out to me the fine points of the Christian religion so, too, have I seen that your Christian religion is far from being practiced today. Jesus was wise and his teachings are sound. But I am afraid that his congregation is only, for the most part, attending his house, to see the decorations inside. I truly wish that this were not so.

That is not the whole truth. But there is enough truth in it to make us declare: we need improved materials and methods, not

only to the end that our worship may be real and our Biblical information sure; we need them also in order that our Christianity may be a vital testimony of fundamental reality to all who are not of the fold.

We should be unfair if we did not recognize the imposing work which has been done in this direction lately. For example, our United Lutheran Church has taken steps during little more than the last decade of which every member justly may be proud. The Parish and Church School Board has produced a body of new materials emphasizing the newer methods which would have seemed impossible to do in that time. We have two new hymnals; a new Weekday Series with a revision already started; a new Vacation School Series; the Christian Life Course; a series of Young People's Electives; a beginning at Adult Elective Units; two Leadership Training Series, Elementary and Advanced; a revision of the Augsburg Lesson Books; the program of the Children of the Church. It is a notable achievement. Nevertheless, it is a task not yet finished.

LEADERSHIP

If the reach and scope of the program of religious education are to be advanced and if its effectiveness is to be increased, there is another fundamental need, namely, a fully trained leadership.

Happily, we are getting that trained leadership. We are getting it within the laity. Perhaps nothing in the whole field is more promising than the widespread interest in leadership education which extends from the Senior Department class in the Sunday school all the way along to the Graduate School in the University. We have gone far since, just a hundred years ago, the American Sunday School Union published the first leadership education text in America, a volume entitled, *The Teacher Taught*. Last season, for example, according to statistics lately received, ten thousand United Lutheran workers took leadership courses.

We are getting a trained leadership within the ministry, too. Our seminaries, almost without exception, are recognizing the

minister's function as educational leader in his parish and are preparing their men for that leadership. This Seminary was among the earlier ones to recognize and meet the need. It is our hope to continue its work in such a way that Gettysburg men shall not be found wanting in this regard.

Recently three types of educational approach were described in a vivid manner. One emphasizes what the subject can do *to* the *student*. Another has in view what the student can do *to* the *subject*. A third considers what the student can do *with* the *subject*.

The last approach will prevail in the religious education division of this department. While, in the case of majors, an effort will be made to provide elementary practice in research, and while the academic standards which should prevail in a professional school will be held in view, the emphasis will be on practical methods particularly for young ministers in small churches.

PROBLEMS

Closely related to the meeting of the needs mentioned above there are many problems to be studied and solved if possible. One cannot list all of them. Several outstanding ones will be mentioned:

1. Clarifying the matter of the theological implications behind our philosophy and practice.

2. Stating satisfactorily the psychological basis for our approach.

3. Discovering how the fires of Christian idealism are stirred into flame.

4. Working out the mutual relations of evangelism and education.

5. Discovering the relation of the church's program of religious education to and working out cooperation with other agencies in education, particularly the public school.

6. Studying the significance of our changing civilization for our religious education.

7. Rebuilding religious education in the home.

8. Relating the educational program and the educational method to the total work of the church.

9. Correlating and unifying the educational agencies of the church.

10. Studying, and alleviating if possible, certain existing tensions between religious education and other educational, social and religious trends.

11. Finally, there is a last problem not of the same type as those already listed. But it is a real one, and I have been asked to discuss it today. It is the problem of establishing the modern religious education movement itself in the regard of many within the church. Let us consider that problem briefly.

Religious education is a very, very old activity of man. Christian religious education to which we have had reference throughout, when considered broadly, began perhaps when Jesus spoke to two of the Baptist's disciples—Andrew and most likely John—saying, "Come and ye shall see."

Time does not suffice to describe the teaching work of the Apostles, informal instruction in the early Christian home and community; catechetical schools and catechumenal education; the rise of monasteries and their service in the Middle Ages; the works of Luther, Melancthon, and other reformers; religion in the American colonial school; the rise of the modern Sunday school movement.

It must be enough to observe that a promising renaissance of interest and development in religious education took place a little more than a quarter of a century ago. It might well be called the modern or scientific movement in religious education. It began early in the century when the Sunday school was thriving and young people's societies were flourishing. A little later two new agencies arose, the Daily Vacation Bible School and the Weekday Church School in the forms most typical now. Approximately coincident, too, was the development of departments of religious education in colleges and universities. By 1925, for example, some ten thousand students were taking courses in those departments.

The plight of those students will serve to make the immediate problem concrete. Many of them were preparing for full time service in the church as Directors of Religious Education. Others planned to be full time Community Weekday School teachers. A considerable number were so employed and many still hold positions of the type for which they prepared. On the other hand, hundreds, even thousands, were doomed to disappointment. Deeply

interested they were. Most of them, we can believe, were fully consecrated. They had, too, the best training available at the time. Yet the church did not use them.

Why did not the church put those people to work? Let us hasten to observe that, to a great degree, it *could* not. The funds simply were not available. In the earlier years, building was a major interest of the church and many of its available resources went into equipment. In later years, the great depression had come, and any expansion of staffs again was out of the question. There was more—an additional reason. Shall we say there was, in many quarters, a lack of satisfaction with the movement itself. In retrospect, one can see several reasons for the attitude which prevailed and in part overtook the promising new movement.

For one thing, the movement was largely under lay leadership, not the official leadership of the church. There is an interesting parallel with the Sunday school movement which, a century earlier, arose outside the church proper. And the Sunday school has scarcely yet been geared into many congregations and some denominations. One can see that a similar movement would scarcely be accepted before it had ample time to prove itself.

Closely related to the above, the interests of the major religious educational leaders were not identical at all points with the interests of the more ecclesiastically minded in the church. Among the former, there was, if not a bit of rebellion against theology, certainly some neglect of it. There was, too, more emphasis on social reconstruction than on church membership, more interest in character and conduct than in piety, more reliance on scientific research than on creedal statement.

Again, the new movement, it must be confessed, early became self-conscious—one might almost say self-conceited. It meant to cut a wide swath; said so, and started mowing. Such an attitude always arouses natural, if not just opposition.

As a further consideration the movement grew too rapidly. The fruits of its activity could not possibly be assimilated into the body of the church and community. Reconstruction does not proceed apace.

Finally, the movement has always been in a ferment as to fundamentals of theory and practice. The condition is not altogether unwholesome. But storm and stress is not the sort of condition which cultivates public favor.

In spite of all these weaknesses and handicaps, the movement has had impressive results:

1. Many of the workers it prepared were placed and many still remain in the calling doing effective work for the cause.

2. Every major denomination revised its curricular series more or less in harmony with principles which grew out of the movement.

3. Many of the college and university departments remain and minister still to thousands of students who will be avocational if not vocational workers in the church.

4. The leadership education movement goes on, manned in many cases by people trained under this movement.

5. A vast quantity of literature remains and while much of it ought, doubtless, to be superseded there is more that is the best we have.

6. The movement promoted Weekday and Vacation Church Schools which are thriving still.

7. The creative approach it fostered is winning its way in current religious teaching.

With returning stability in international affairs, there is good reason to believe that the eclipse of the modern movement will prove to have been only partial. Perhaps the middle of the century as well as its beginning will be marked by a renaissance in religious education,—this the rebirth of the modern movement, tested, rectified in part, purged in part, proved in part. When a force has something essential to do with such results, it possesses values which will not be lost.

BIBLE

As we have thought of "religious education tomorrow" we have not failed to see that the Bible must be *an* essential factor throughout. Indeed, if it be properly understood, we can say *the* essential factor. We will strive to reach others precisely in order that they may know the Gospel which the Bible represents. We will seek more time for our program to the end that the message of the Bible may be more fully apprehended. Our materials will

be improved so as to represent the Bible more adequately. Our methods will be planned to deal more fittingly with the pupil in his relation to the Bible and the faith and life it engenders. A primary factor in the training of our leaders will be their increasing familiarity with the Bible in precept and in practice.

Thus, it was a work of Providence when the Directors joined Religious Education and English Bible in one department here. The more one contemplates that matter, the more one realizes its fitness. Religious education would be empty without its message, the Bible. The Bible needs to be taught with the highest effectiveness of which men are capable. The prospective pastor needs to be skilled in both, separately, and in their mutual relationships.

There is a problem of terminology in the title of the department. Throughout our study this morning, as the term "religious education" was employed, we were conscious of an inexactness in that usage. We meant, of course, "Christian education." Moreover, we were referring chiefly to that aspect of Christian education for which the term "parish education" is very fitting.

In former years there was good reason to use "religious education" instead of "Christian education" because the latter had been applied largely to the field of higher schools. Custom is rapidly eliminating that difficulty. Further, if the difficulty should be considered insurmountable still, there is the designation "parish education" for our work.

Therefore, I plan in time respectfully to ask that our President and our Directors may consider the possibility and desirability of using for this chair a more specific title—"Christian Education and English Bible," or "Parish Education and English Bible."

But titles are not essentials. We return to a consideration of the Bible in "religious education tomorrow." We return to note a happy trend. Growing evangelicalism bids fair to place an unaccustomed emphasis upon the Bible and Bible study throughout Christendom. To be sure Lutheranism has steadfastly maintained her formal principle—the canonical Scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments as the only infallible rule of Christian faith, and

practice. Accordingly, the Bible has retained a relatively high degree of prominence in our pulpits, our Church Schools, our catechetical classes, our homes, our colleges and our seminaries. Now it appears that our attitude and practice will become more general, for the interest of Christians everywhere is turning to the Scriptures. In the findings of the youth congress in Amsterdam we read this strong statement of conviction born of new experience with the Bible there:

Many of us have discovered the Bible afresh, and insofar as we have allowed God to speak to us He has become a living God, declaring a living message for our own lives and our generation. We confess, however, to our humiliation, that our study has revealed considerable unfamiliarity with the Bible.

Is it not due to this that we are not clear and articulate about the fundamentals of our faith and do not take a definite stand in relation to the many conflicting ideologies and blind faiths which find so many followers among youth? Therefore we summon ourselves and our fellow Christians to consecrated and intelligent study of the Bible, to hear in it the word of life which Christ speaks to us.

There is, too, a glowing pronouncement in the report of the Madrás Conference. As quoted in *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* (July, 1939), it read:

If the Church is to repossess its faith in all its uniqueness and adequacy and power, one indispensable thing demanding special emphasis today is the continuous nourishing of its life upon the Bible. We are bold therefore to summon all Christians to a deeper and more consistent study of the Bible, instructor and sustainer of the Christian faith through the ages. Only as in its light they seek together in prayer and meditation the guidance of the Holy Spirit, will they be able to fulfill their calling amidst the confusion and unbelief of this age.

Several years ago I wrote in *The Parish School*: "Sometime the Church will take Bible study seriously. It will foster with every resource a mighty program of Bible study among its people. . . . Then will come the grandest century the Church has known since the first century." Are we, under God, approaching that time?

In the light of that possibility for widespread interest in Bible study; in view of the current Scriptural trend in Christianity; in

consideration of the place of Bible in "religious education tomorrow"; remembering, too, the historic attitude of the Lutheran Church whereby it exalts the Scriptures in its total ministry: it will be a supreme privilege to lead the young men of the Seminary in their English Bible courses.

Such departments and courses came late into our theological curricula. Consequently their offerings and procedures are, as yet, unstandardized. Strangely, too, relatively little time is required to read all that is in print on the subject of advanced English Bible study and English Bible teaching. We must start, therefore, with a spirit of creative adventure.

The emphasis will be upon content and use,—more exactly content with respect to use. Adjustments to the total setting of a theological school must be made. Then, within that framework, there will be three lines of effort: (a) to introduce the student to a type of Bible study which he may wish to continue after his graduation, (b) to foster still larger understanding of the Bible, keener appreciation of its content, and closer familiarity with as many passages, books, and sections of the Bible as possible, (c) to look toward still more effective use of the Scriptures for preaching, teaching, devotional study and pastoral purposes.

In June of 1939 several thousands of persons gathered around a flag-draped statue in Queen's Park, Toronto, Canada. With the sound of trumpets a boy from Halifax, Nova Scotia and a girl from Savannah, Georgia pulled two strings. Thereupon, the Union Jack and Old Glory fell away unveiling the heroic statue of Robert Raikes. That event commemorated the one-hundred-fiftieth anniversary of the date when that Christian gentleman of Gloucester, England inaugurated the modern Sunday school movement.

In 1780 there were no Sunday school pupils anywhere under the sun. In 1930, one hundred and fifty years later, there were thirty million of them everywhere around the globe. Can we not let that extraordinary development stand as a symbol of promise for "religious education tomorrow?" Shall we not couple faith with vision to believe that, progressively, the problems will be solved and the needs met? Let us declare that "religious education to-

morrow" will be a more effective program, under a more fully prepared leadership, dealing more worthily with the Scriptures and their precious message.

DEDICATION

In conclusion, let us all gather dedication from those Scriptures.

The religion of the Old Testament is a religion of *teaching*. Moses and Aaron were appointed *teachers* of Israel. Such *leaders* as Joshua, Ezra, and Nehemiah, *instructed* the people in public assemblies. There were *schools of the prophets*. *Teaching* was another function of the *priests*. The *sages* were recognized *teachers* of the people. The great *prophets* were alike great *teachers*. The Old Testament *people* respected the command in Deuteronomy 11:18, 19:

Therefore shall ye lay up these my words in your heart and in your soul; and ye shall bind them for a sign upon your hand, and they shall be for frontlets between your eyes. And ye shall teach them your children, talking of them, when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up.

The New Testament shows that Christianity began as a teaching movement. In the Gospels, Jesus is forty-five times called "*teacher*." The word "*disciple*" or "*learner*" is used 175 times. In the Acts of the Apostles, "*teach*," "*teaching*," and "*making disciples*" are used twenty-one times and Paul everywhere is recognized as a teacher.

In his epistles, Paul used "*knowledge*" and "*doctrine*" forty-two times. "Take my yoke upon you," is by many interpreted as a didactic phrase meaning, "Become my pupils." "Come ye after me," is an invitation to become learners of the Great Teacher. "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," is a clear warrant for the educational method.

There is more, too. And with these words as marching orders, we enlist in the effort to meet, with God's help, the challenge of "religious education tomorrow,"—the challenge of Christian religious education, parish religious education, Biblical religious education. The words are: "Go ye therefore . . . teaching."

NOTES AND STUDIES

THE FUTILITY OF THE CENSORSHIP IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY FRANCE¹

ALBERT BACHMAN
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

THE gradual, though explainable, breakdown of censorship in the course of the eighteenth century was a consequence as much of the glaring internal weakness of censorship as an institution, as of the general disapproval of the practice of this law by Jesuits, Jansenists, and Philosophers alike.

The history of censorship in the first half of the eighteenth century is really an episode of the struggle between the monarchical and religious conservatism, on one hand, and the progressive Philosophic Spirit, on the other. I found it, therefore, necessary to use certain aspects of the religious, political and social history of this period as a background.

1 The number of works on eighteenth century thought movements is constantly increasing. For convenience's sake they may be divided into two principal groups (1) the more specialized investigations and (2) the comprehensive works of those who by means of the synthetic method represent eighteenth century thought as an organic growth of the Gallic spirit. In late years appeared in rapid succession Professor Mornet's *Les Origines Intellectuelles de la Révolution Française, 1715-1787* (Librairie Armand Colin, 1933), Professor Paul Hazard's *La Crise de la Conscience Européenne, 1680-1715* (Boivin & Cie, Paris, 1935), and Professor Ira O. Wade's *The Clandestine Organization and Diffusion of Philosophic Ideas in France from 1700-1750* (Princeton University Press, 1938).

When I assigned to myself, ten years ago, the task of elucidating the censorship activities in France prior to the French Revolution of 1789, I had not the faintest idea of how revealing this investigation promised to become. Through the first volume *Censorship in France from 1715 to 1750: Voltaire's Opposition* (Institute of French Studies, Columbia University, 1934) I filled the gap between Miss H. D. MacPherson's *Censorship under Louis XIV* and J. P. Belin's *Le Commerce des Livres Prohibés de 1748 à 1789*.

For the study of this neglected period between 1715 and 1750 I have made considerable use of voluminous source material in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. The 133 manuscript volumes of the *Collection Anisson-Duperron* comprise the greater part of the archives of the Chambre Syndicale des Imprimeurs et des Libraires. The *Collection de Joly de Fleury* and the *Archives de la Bastille* yielded additional information.

I did not attempt to give an exhaustive list of the censored works during the three or four decades covered in the first volume. The actual number of suppressions runs into the thousands, and around each one of them a story could be woven of more or less anecdotal interest. While using many of the more typical cases as illustrations, I have preferred to present a connected history of censorship, the conflicts between the various censorship authorities and the causes of their internal corruption.

Inasmuch as the *raison d'être* of the monarchical principle in France consisted primarily in the protection and defence of the integrity and honor of the family, the King deemed it to be his duty to appease and harmonize the ever tumultuous social groups or political factions of the nation. The means proposed and generally practiced was to maintain each body of authority in the full possession of its prerogatives and privileges, so that each one could act as a check on the other. As a consequence, since arbitrary government and the constant increase of special privileges formed the cornerstone of the Ancient Régime, the administrations of the successive periods tended to enlarge the incoherent mass of customs and privileges.

Nowhere, however, did the chaos of the conflicting authorities of the *Ancien Régime* become more glaring than in ecclesiastical affairs. The ecclesiastico-political turmoils which arose in connection with the *Bull Unigenitus* were largely responsible for breaking up the traditional unity of the Roman Catholic Church in France. It was decreed that the *Bull Unigenitus*, commonly styled the *Constitution*, should be enforced through the regular channel of ecclesiastical procedure. France was divided into two distinct religious camps, the partisans of the Gallican Liberties (sort of state rights within the Roman Catholic Church) and the followers of the Jesuits. This Bull concerned not only the theologians and the magistrates, but it became an instrument to arouse the passions of the people. This Jansenist-Jesuit controversy stirred the soul of the French people to its very depth. These theological discussions greatly furthered the cause of free-thinking and liberalism. It was in this connection that Voltaire pertinently remarked that the real sources of Atheism lie in these internecine theological disputes.

The religious fervor with which those doctrinal discussions were carried on kept the whole nation in a state of suspense. The *Constitution* became the hotbed of all sorts of seditious and religious fanaticism, a fact which hastened the process of disintegration of both the Catholic faith and the traditional form of government.

The Parliament of Paris supported both secretly and overtly the Jansenists in their opposition against the *Constitution*. In such an atmosphere of general unrest the Philosophers were quietly preparing themselves for their great mission. In evidence of that situation Voltaire wrote: "Since it is forbidden to write, I am going to think freely while the Jansenists and Jesuits weaken each other through their internecine warfare."

Both Parliament and the Jesuits after the other's defeat tried with every possible means to discredit their opponents by spreading all sorts of venomous pamphlets. Each party pretended that the other was a power of corruption and perniciousness. The censorship code was always violated whenever it was found expedient to do so. Thus shouted, on a certain occasion, the clandestine *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques* of the Jansenist party that this monstrous

"Constitution va insulter le Tout-Puissant jusque dans sa redoutable sainteté."

The Jansenists in proclaiming the independence of the human conscience paved the way for the freedom of thought. The Jesuit, Joseph Hilgers, in his *Index der Verbotenen Buecher* characterizes the Jansenists as follows: "During the eighteenth century, through Jansenism which affected a large part of the community in France, place was being made for free thought philosophy which later became responsible for the great Revolution, and the result was the burst of a storm of public opinion against the Jesuits. In 1761, the Parliament of Paris prohibited twenty-four works by Jesuit writers and a year later, in a fresh prohibition condemned a hundred and sixty-three Jesuit treatises. The contention was made in these edicts that the prohibited works had had an exciting and pernicious effect, had served to undermine Christian morality, and had tended to demoralize the life and to impair the safety of the citizens. It was further contended that the opinions presented in these writings constituted an assault against the persons of the princes. These pernicious and godless heresies of the Jansenists continued to gain strength; the Jesuit Order in France became one of the first victims of the heresy."

In such an atmosphere censorship became of necessity the football of religio-political factions. But before we undertake the brief discussion of the censor's métier let us refresh our mind with the fact that the Philosophers under Voltaire's leadership aimed at the establishment of the right of free-thinking and demanded a larger measure of humanitarian living. Their new thought patterns threatened to revolutionize the foundations of life. Thus we notice how the novel ideas, which at first appeared by way of criticism, were destined to become the moving forces of the eighteenth century.

It is sometimes exceedingly difficult for a convinced Protestant to grasp the meaning of this eighteenth century destructive criticism against the Christian religion and the Bible, but one ought not overlook the fact that for France the abolition of the divine rights of kings had to be preceded by the procedure of scepticism concerning the divinity of the Christian religion. From a Protestant historicalness France would have fared much better, if instead of destroying the metaphysical background of the Christian religion, the Philosophers had limited their attacks to then prevailing theory of statecraft. But again Voltaire's battle cry "Ecrasez l'infâme" was more than a mere strategic move against the ecclesiastical hierarchy of France, it was of universal purport. In general, the eighteenth century French Philosophers searched for new tenets of human society.

Voltaire who exemplifies the rising power of the Commoner knew how to outwit the censorship authorities. His associations with anti-censorship

groups, to wit the more enterprising printers of Rouen, goes back to the early part of his career as a defiant author when he tried to release secretly his great epic poem *La Henriade*. Voltaire is a typical eighteenth century man of wit. Not only did he know how to express potently the new ideas which were like a beacon to his contemporaries, but, as a good propagandist, he also looked after the sundry channels for their diffusion. Voltaire took an active part in the clandestine printing of many of his manuscripts. Through his obstinate and elusive campaign against every type of oppression of the censorship boards, he succeeded in creating a regular technique of escape from censorship.

In a second volume, for which the compilation of the source material has just been completed, I hope to delineate the character of De Malesherbes, the great patron of the eighteenth century men of letters. He seemed to have divined the mission of the Philosophers. All while being a zealous supporter of the principle of monarchy, he hoped to give strength to its authority by rendering it just. He found with the fanatically pious people as much fault as he did with the radical element among the writers. In a letter to J. J. Rousseau he wrote: "Je compatis à toutes les passions vraies, je crois même que je m'intéresse plus à proportion de ce qu'elles sont plus vives; je n'ai aversion que pour l'injustice et pour la fausseté, et encore je ne sais si cette aversion n'a pas été quelquefois au sentiment qui me ramène toujours vers les gens de lettres."

The extreme severity of censorship in the early decades of the eighteenth century resulted in the withdrawal of a great number of books from the legal channel of booktrade. Yet, in most instances they reached the public either through the contraband trade from adjacent countries or clandestine editions from the hidden domestic presses. Thus we find that all along the frontier—at Bouillon, Sedan, Lille, Avignon, etc., relay stores were established for a prosperous smuggling trade.

It soon became apparent that toleration of one kind or another might be a wiser policy than ruthless suppression, but the authorities neither dared nor wished to proclaim full liberty of the press. Thus was inaugurated a half-way measure, the so-called *permission tacite*, a form of toleration which, in practice, kept all the evils of a capricious censorship alive, without conferring any of the benefits of toleration and free discussion. This semi-official channel of the *permission tacite* was devised as an emergency measure, in order to counterbalance clandestine printing.

The practice of the *permission tacite* covered a whole series of concealments, such as omitting the name of the censor, giving fictitious or deliberately wrong names where the printing took place, etc. To illustrate the case in point let me quote from a censor's report: "Throughout the work runs an uncontrollable desire to criticize the priests; one would easily detect Voltaire's style and bile. If M. de Malesherbes (in charge of the censorship board)

deigns to accord the author a *permission tacite* and if the book could be announced as having been printed in London, none of the readers would ever suspect that the real author is a French monk of the Benedictine Order."

The *permission tacite* brought about a temporary truce between the intellectual leaders of the century and the King, the waning shadow of past glories. Originally censorship was designed to form an impregnable bastion of the Ancien Régime. With its help the reactionary forces expected to maintain their domination over intellectual freedom, but the keen desire of the French public for forbidden books resulted in (1) the growth of contraband trade and (2) clandestine printing beside the licensed press. The prohibitive laws forced the booksellers and printers either into bankruptcy or illicit trading and printing.

Psychologically speaking, the rigid measures as advocated by the censorship authorities were chiefly instrumental in helping to focus the ideas which were meant to be uprooted. This was clearly in evidence in Voltaire's remarks: "C'est le propre des censures violentes d'accréditer les opinions qu'elles attaquent."

In summing up the gist of the first volume of the investigation on eighteenth century censorship activities, it might be said that during the early decades of the eighteenth century censorship presents the picture of a gradual disintegration of antagonistic authorities as censors. The subsequent transformations were caused by the relentless pressure of contentious circumstances and public opinion, of philosophic audacity, and the determination of the men of letters. Its half-hearted but effective surrender was due to the *permission tacite*. Even without this confession of defeat, censorship as an institution would have been stunted and rendered ineffective by its internal disorganization, the irrepressible flow of forbidden books from abroad and the activities of clandestine presses at home.

In a broader sense, this study may illustrate the futility of prohibitive mandates of restraint on the human conscience and mind.

A NEW STANDARD FOR CONFIRMED MEMBERSHIP

PAUL E. KEYSER

Ridgway, Pennsylvania

WHAT persons shall be counted and reported to Synod as "confirmed members" of the congregation? When is a confirmed member "in good standing" or active? How may inactive members be led to greater activity? What can and should be done with "delinquent" members? How should discipline be administered?

These are vital questions which the conscientious pastor and church council face repeatedly in the practical administration of a congregation. They are questions on which there is wide divergence of opinion among the officials of most congregations. They are, also, questions to which no "final" or "one best" answer can be given. Possibly this helps to account for the wide variety in the membership policies and practices of congregations in the United Lutheran Church. And certainly, because of their nature, there is a pressing need in our church for serious study of our membership standards and the ways in which they are administered.

It is with a sense of the timeliness of this study that we report here a new "Standard of Active Confirmed Membership" which was adopted by the Pittsburgh Synod in May 1939 and recommended to its 300 congregations. This new standard is of particular interest because it goes beyond the present requirements for members "in good standing" in the model constitution for congregations of the United Lutheran Church, and grows out of a survey of the present membership standards and practices of a representative number and group of congregations on the Pittsburgh Synod. In order that the reader may grasp the full meaning of this standard, we also report something of the preliminary survey made by the synodical committee prior to the preparation of the new standard and the plan for its use by congregations.

When, in 1937, the Pittsburgh Synod adopted a memorial from its Northeast Conference expressing a strong sense of need for "a generally accepted standard for determining what constitutes 'active confirmed membership' in a congregation," and "a definite plan by which a congregation may enforce this standard," it recognized a need which the Committee's survey discovered was most real and general.

The first important finding of the survey was that there is no "generally accepted standard of active confirmed membership" among the congregations of synod. (We believe this is also true for the entire U.L.C.A.) This finding is borne out by an analysis of the constitutions and other membership rules of congregations which show wide variation in the number and type of membership duties and in the requirements for remaining "in good standing." It was also noted that the provisions of congregational constitutions and rules on these matters varied considerably from those contained in the model constitutions for congregations as recommended by the Synod and the U.L.C.A.

A majority of the pastors, moreover, declared that the prevailing membership standards of their congregations were "unsatisfactory" and that they welcomed the help of synod in developing a more satisfactory one.

The second important finding was that most congregations lack a definite and satisfactory plan for enforcing their membership standards. It was also noted that the prevailing plans and practices of the majority of the congregations were indefinite, varied from time to time, and neither agreed

with each other or with those recommended in the model constitutions for congregations. (The model constitutions of synod and the U.L.C.A. were indefinite and incomplete on these matters and did not agree with each other.) Further, many pastors recognize the inadequacy of present plans and practices and welcome help in finding a better plan.

From both a theoretical and practical viewpoint, a standard of confirmed membership which would be generally accepted and uniformly used among congregations would have the following values and advantages:

(1) "Confirmed membership" would tend to mean the same in all congregations, in fact as well as in official definition.

(2) This uniformity of meaning would be an asset both to individuals and congregations in the many cases of members who transfer from congregation to congregation.

(3) The membership statistics of congregations and larger church groups would be more truly comparable than at present.

(4) Pastors and church councilmen would accumulate experience and skill in upholding the same membership standard in various congregations.

(5) The foundation would be laid for a more uniform practice among congregations in the education and discipline of members.

It was with these probable values in mind that the Pittsburgh Synod adopted the standard and plan summarized below, recommended it to all its congregations, authorized its publication in quantities sufficient for every family in its congregations, and authorized its special committee to continue for three years to assist in introducing the standard in its 300 congregations.

PART I. A STANDARD OF ACTIVE CONFIRMED MEMBERSHIP

(Explanatory Note: The purpose of this standard is (1) to indicate who shall be classified as confirmed members of a congregation; (2) to set forth the duties of confirmed members; and (3) to indicate the minimum requirements for a confirmed member to be "active" or "in good standing.")

This standard should be used by the pastor and the church council as a guide in: (1) determining which members shall be classified as "confirmed" members; (2) the preparation of candidates for confirmed membership; (3) the education of confirmed members on the meaning and requirements of membership; (4) determining which confirmed members are worthy of enjoying the full privileges of their membership; (5) discovering which confirmed members are negligent of their duty and in need of special education or discipline—for example, all inactive members according to this standard would be in this group; and (6) discovering which confirmed members are the active working force and strength of the church. *This standard will have little value for a congregation unless used in these ways as outlined in more detail in what follows.*)

1. A DEFINITION OF CONFIRMED MEMBERSHIP

Every person properly received into full membership in the congregation by confirmation, adult baptism, certificate of transfer, profession or renewal of faith, or restoration shall be considered a "confirmed" member.

2. THE DUTIES OF CONFIRMED MEMBERS

(Note: This list of general duties represents the ideal toward which all members should direct their efforts. It emphasizes the main points in Christian living and good churchmanship. The meaning and the ways of performing these duties should be made plain to all members by such means as instruction, printed matter, letters, and example.)

It shall be the duty of every confirmed member:

- (a) To attend the public worship services of the congregation regularly;
- (b) To partake of the Lord's Supper whenever there is opportunity to do so;
- (c) To seek God's gifts of grace and a better understanding of His Will by the study and hearing of His Word, the use of reliable Christian literature, the practice of private and family worship, and by participating in the organized life of the congregation as time and opportunity permit;
- (d) To abide and live by the Christian faith in all personal and social relationships (daily life in harmony with the example and teachings of Christ);
- (e) To further the improvement, growth, and general welfare of the congregation and the church at large by whole-hearted moral support and by such personal services as there is ability and opportunity to render;
- (f) To contribute to the financial support of the congregation's local and world-wide work regularly and as God prospers him;
- (g) To assist the pastor and other officials of the church by coöperating with them in their work;
- (h) To show love and goodwill toward all men, especially fellow-Christians and the needy and distressed everywhere;
- (i) To help win the unsaved to Christ and His church by the witness of word and example;
- (j) To bring children in early infancy to Holy Baptism and to provide for their subsequent Christian education and preparation for confirmation;
- (k) To be loyal to one's own vows made at the time of reception into confirmed membership;
- (l) To obey the rules and regulations of the congregation pertaining to membership and participation in the life of the church.

3. ACTIVE AND INACTIVE CONFIRMED MEMBERS

All confirmed members shall be classified, at least annually, as "active" or "inactive" according to the following definitions:

Active members shall be those who (a) commune at least once during the last twelve month period, (b) attend public worship services conscientiously, (c) contribute to both the local support and general beneficence funds of the congregation as God prospers them—unless hindered from doing one or more of these things by sickness or other circumstances beyond their control, and (d) sincerely endeavor to live the Christian life. (This definition raises the present standard—by which a member is "in good standing" when he merely communes once a year and contributes something—to a level where he is *literally* "active.")

Inactive members shall be all confirmed members, resident or non-resident, who shall, in the judgment of the church council, not have earned or merited classification as "active" according to the above statement. Failure to measure up to any one or more of the four minimum requirements for "active" membership, unless hindered by circumstances beyond the member's control, would place a member in this "inactive" group.

PART II. A PLAN FOR ADMINISTERING THE STANDARD

The plan outlined below specifies how a congregation should use the standard of confirmed membership described in Part I. As stated in the explanatory note under the standard, the standard itself will be of little value to a congregation unless it is used as a practical guide for (a) the education of prospective and present members; (b) the classification of members as "active" and "inactive" for purposes of intelligent membership work; and (c) the discipline of delinquent members. The plan reported here does not attempt to specify detailed procedures for use by congregations; it simply lays down some general principles and suggests general methods for the application of the standard by the congregation's officials. In adopting such a plan, both the Committee and Synod have provided for originality and variety in the detailed administrative work of congregations.

1. THE EDUCATION OF MEMBERS AND PROSPECTIVE MEMBERS

Every confirmed member should know and understand (a) his general duties, (b) the minimum requirements for being considered an "active" member, and (c) the probable disadvantages and penalties of failing to perform his duties. This is an obvious requirement for intelligent churchmanship and Christian living. It is also obvious that no congregation should attempt to discipline offending members without their previously being given adequate opportunity to know and measure up to the required standard. Both the prevailing ignorance of many church members on their duties and the regulations governing their membership and the wisdom of gradually introducing and enforcing such a Standard as this by a process of education, suggest that each congregation systematically re-educate all confirmed members on all membership matters and then periodically recall these matters to their attention as a guide and incentive to good churchmanship and Christian living.

It is equally important that no prospective member be confirmed or otherwise received without clear instruction on the congregation's membership standard and regulations.

A definite plan for the education of prospective and present members in these matters should, therefore, be adopted by each congregation under the leadership of the pastor and church council. This plan should include a judicious choice and use of such means as: (a) printed matter, (b) Sunday bulletins, (c) parish papers, (d) talks before organizations and classes, (e) sermons, (f) special lessons and courses for prospective members, (g) form letters, (h) elective courses in Sunday school like, *What a Church Member Ought to Know* by Zinck; (i) pastoral calls, and (j) personal conferences. A well-laid plan, using such means as these, will take some real effort and some expense, but it will bear rewarding fruit in a very basic phase of church life.

2. CLASSIFYING MEMBERS AS "ACTIVE" AND "INACTIVE" AND WORK WITH INACTIVES

All the confirmed members of a congregation should be classified, at least annually, as "active" or "inactive" according to the definitions given in the Standard. This should be done by some official or group authorized by the church council, preferably a membership committee and the pastor. (If proper attention is given to membership matters, especially if this Standard and Plan is used, there will be need for a regular committee

on membership to give supervision to all membership problems. The pastor, of course, should be a close adviser to this committee.)

The purpose of this periodic classification of members is to discover which members need to be led to a greater degree of activity and loyalty and which members may need to be disciplined.

The list of "active" members will show which members are "in good standing" and therefore entitled to vote at business meetings and be considered for office (subject to constitutional limitations in various congregations). This list should be used for this purpose and may also be used as a kind of "Honor Roll" to recognize members who attain this "active" rating. It may be posted or published.

The "inactive" list will indicate the members who have not measured up to one or more of the minimum requirements for "active" membership. Such members deserve special attention and should be considered as a special field for friendly contact, re-education, systematic personal visitation by the pastor and a group of select lay workers, and intercessory prayer. Since a congregation will probably always have some "inactive" members, it should have a regular program to seek to win such members back to active membership. The pastor and the church council are responsible for initiating and directing this program. The church is a shepherd of souls; as such it must ever seek the straying and lost sheep—even those who stray away carelessly and willfully. To do anything less is to be disloyal to our Lord and to neglect a God-given task.

Non-resident inactives—members who have moved from the community—and those whose whereabouts are unknown or seemingly impossible to determine should be given special attention. Before or soon after members leave town, the pastor should inform them of the Lutheran church and pastor nearest their new residence, and also advise this pastor of their presence in his community. Non-resident members should be encouraged to transfer their membership to a church in their own community. Even though it takes years to effect a transfer, periodic contact should be maintained with non-resident members by their home church and occasional special efforts made to bring about the transfer. In cases where the exact address of non-resident members is unknown, or information is lacking on the nearest Lutheran church, the available information on these members should be sent to the nearest known Lutheran pastor or to the synodical president or missionary superintendent in that territory, and their aid solicited in relocating the member. A congregation should carry the names of all non-resident members—even though they will usually be "inactive"—until their membership is officially terminated in an approved manner as hereinafter provided.

As to just how long a congregation should keep inactive members on the roll without invoking the penalty of suspension or excommunication, the Council should decide.

3. REPORTING "ACTIVE" AND "INACTIVE" CONFIRMED MEMBERS TO SYNOD

Each congregation shall report annually to the synod, in connection with its annual parochial report, the number of its "active" and "inactive" confirmed members at the close of the year covered by the parochial report, in the manner specified by the statistical secretary of Synod. (This could be done by a supplemental form to the regular parochial report blank or by a notation on the blank itself.)

The purpose of reporting these figures is: (a) to require congregations to use this Standard and Plan annually; (b) to stimulate congregations to increase the number of "active" members; and (c) to give Synod a truer picture of the real membership strength of its congregations.

(In this connection, the Committee *suggests* the desirability of (a) eventually dropping the rubric "Communing Members" in the parochial report, and the rubric "Con-

tributing Members," and substituting "Active" and "Inactive" Confirmed Members, at such time as this change might be effected throughout the United Lutheran Church; and (b) giving serious consideration to levying the apportionment to congregations on the basis of "Active Confirmed" members instead of on "Communing Members" as at present, since "active" members would seem to be a more just norm for ability to pay than "communing" members. This new basis for apportionment might be effected within our Synod regardless of current practice in other synods.)

4. THE DISCIPLINE OF "INACTIVE" MEMBERS

A congregation should have a definite plan for correcting the delinquency of the members it has determined are "inactive." In a broad sense, whatever is done in this direction with the motive of the members' welfare and spiritual training in mind may be and herein is properly referred to as the "discipline" of members.

(a) *All Inactives Subject to Discipline.* The failure of a member to maintain the status of "active" membership, as previously defined, or to perform any of the other duties of confirmed membership shall render him liable to discipline. The case of each member on the "inactive" list should be given careful consideration, soon after the list is prepared, to determine the most appropriate form of discipline for the person concerned.

(b) *Those Responsible for Discipline.* The church council, as the representative of the congregation, shall administer discipline in accordance with this Plan (and other regulations which the congregation may have or adopt) subject, of course, to appeal as provided in the Constitution of Synod. It shall have power to request a member to explain his failure to perform any or all of his duties as a member and, if the explanation be unsatisfactory and the case require it, to apply, upon proper evidence of the delinquency, the appropriate degree of discipline (see below). In case an appeal is made from some form of discipline, the counsel of the President of Conference shall be sought and respectfully considered.

(c) *Offences To Be Given Special Attention.* While failure of a member to perform any specified duty would justifiably subject him to some degree of discipline, the power to discipline should be selectively and judiciously applied. Special attention should always be given such offences as:

- i. Failure to attend church services regularly.
- ii. Failure to commune at least once a year.
- iii. Failure to contribute or to contribute regularly as God has prospered.
- iv. Failure to conform to the general standards of Christian living, such as when there is scandalous and immoral conduct, flagrant dishonesty, violation of law, gross intemperance, open heresy, persistent trouble-making in the congregation, and other conduct grossly unbecoming a member of the Christian church.

In all cases involving the above offences the Council should give careful study to the evidence of the offence and the circumstances producing it (as far as these can be determined) and seek to apply, in a friendly and helpful manner, that form and degree of discipline which seems to be best for the welfare of the offending member's soul and the welfare of the church itself. *The exercise of disciplinary power should never be an end in itself; it should always be reverently used to uphold and rebuild the spiritual life of delinquent members according to the ideal of the Word of God.*

(d) *Penalties or Degrees of Discipline.* Keeping in mind that the practical value of church discipline is (i) to encourage offending members to discharge their full obligations, (ii) to uphold an ideal or standard of church membership, and (iii) to strengthen the life and membership of the church, any one or more of the following degrees of discipline may be applied when, in the judgment of the church council, the case warrants:

- i. Notification of failure to attain "active" membership rating.

ii. Verbal or written request for an explanation of failure to perform the specified minimum duties of "active" membership.

iii. Friendly admonition and counsel on the need and value of measuring up to the membership standard.

iv. Posting or publishing names of all "inactive" members.

v. Verbal censure before the Council or congregation.

vi. Suspension of certain membership rights and privileges for a specified period or until evidence is given Council of repentance and a sincere desire to resume active membership.

vii. Exclusion or excommunication—barring all rights and privileges except that of attending public worship until there is a sincere and willing renewal of faith and membership vows. This, in effect, is removal from membership.

In no case should a penalty be applied and then the offending member be forgotten or neglected. As long as there is a possibility of securing genuine repentance, a renewal of faith, and a desire to be restored to membership, these things should be patiently and prayerfully sought.

(e) *Restoration of Membership.* In all cases of discipline and protracted "inactive" membership standing, the way should be open for the offending members to have their full membership rights and privileges restored. This is especially important in cases of suspension and excommunication. It may be accomplished by encouraging and directing the requests of offenders for the privilege of restoration. Some congregations use a formal card application for this purpose. In any case, the application should be acted upon by the Council, and, if accepted, public announcement made of the restoration in the milder cases of discipline and public renewal of faith and vows required in the case of the long-inactive and excommunicated. In such cases, the Council should insist on sincerity of purpose and reasonable evidence of repentance.

5. METHODS OF TERMINATING MEMBERSHIP

Every confirmed member shall be counted as such until his name be duly removed by (a) death, (b) transfer to another congregation or joining without a letter of transfer, (c) voluntary withdrawal, or (d) excommunication. No other methods should be used or causes accepted for terminating membership. (Suspension is not the actual termination of membership; it is temporarily withholding some or all membership rights and privileges.)

Requests for transfers to other churches should be promptly honored when there is evidence of sincerity of purpose and of the new relationship working for the best interests of the parties concerned. Letters should be granted for even "inactive" members, but should be accompanied by word as to the member's real status. Before marking off members reported to have become affiliated with other churches without letters of transfer, satisfactory evidence of the affiliation should be secured.

Requests for voluntary withdrawal, sometimes called "resignations," may be granted when there is adequate reason, but should not be granted until every effort has been made to overcome the objection, remove the cause, and win the member to a decision to retain membership. For obvious reasons, the possibility of resigning should not be played up.

Excommunication actually terminates membership, but is subject, of course, to restoration by the proper procedure.

The termination of membership by other methods, such as arbitrarily "dropping" or "crossing off" the roll (usually without the member's consent), is wholeheartedly condemned as a rule. Such methods may seem an easy way out for the congregation, but because they simply release persons to the world and thereby often cut them off from

any chance for salvation they should be avoided. No matter how "inactive" a member may be and remain, or for how long a time, he should be listed on the roll as a member and reasonable and seasonable efforts made to reclaim him. The fact that some church keeps his name makes someone responsible for his eventual reclamation.

"Active" or "inactive" membership is terminated automatically as a member qualifies for one or the other classification. Thus, a member may shift from one group to the other from time to time.

PRESENT EFFORT OF THE PITTSBURGH SYNOD

The new standard and plan reported above have already been approved and adopted by the Synod and recommended to all its congregations. Additional resolutions have been adopted by synod (1) asking each pastor to present the approved standard and plan to his congregation(s) and urge their adoption as the official membership requirements and plan of the congregation(s); (2) authorizing the Executive Committee of Synod to (a) make copies of the new standard and plan available to all congregations, (b) study and revise synod's model constitution for congregations in order to incorporate the basic features of the new standard and plan, and (c) to make the new model constitution available to congregations; and (3) continuing the special committee on Standard of Active Confirmed Membership for three years (a) to promote the introduction and use of the standard and plan, (b) periodically to study the extent to which the congregations of synod are using the standard and plan, and (c) report to synod on these matters.

(For additional information, see "The Report of the Committee on Standard of Active Confirmed Membership," *Minutes of the Pittsburgh Synod*, 1939, pp. 180-188, or write to the author of this article at 329 South St., Ridgway, Pa.)

AMERICAN LUTHERAN PREACHING

T. BENTON PEERY

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

IN attempting to express in writing these thoughts on the preaching in the Lutheran Church in America, I do so as an observer and not as a critic. The age in which we live is not altogether kind to preaching. While millions worship regularly in our churches and hear the preaching that is offered, there are countless millions who never go near the church and seem totally indifferent to anything the preacher may say. Some few scoff at the church, many pass it by on the other side, and but few remain to pray. Many people simply do not take seriously this serious business of preaching.

It is an unwelcome fact, without adequate explanation, that our church, as a factor, a force, an influence in American life, stands far below that its membership would warrant. Among the Protestant bodies we rank third in membership, but do we rank third or fourth as a factor in the nation's life? Why is this so? No Lutheran has ever been president of the United States. Our leaders of great ability have been very modest. Our church has not contributed its share to the hundreds of national celebrities known to the general public. The fact affects our status as a church, our preaching excellence and the recognition of our men in the pulpits. Let us consider further.

I. THE LUTHERAN SERMON

The sermon in the Lutheran church has always been used to exalt the Word. The written Word is the basis of the sermon and controls it. In it the Christian congregation shows that it has appropriated by faith the essential contents of the Scriptures. Luther placed great emphasis upon preaching the Word and he was able to do it effectively. He said "Where God's Word is not preached, it were better that there were no singing, or reading, or assembly. The greatest and principal part of the worship of God is preaching and teaching the Word."¹ The sermon may be derived in part from other sources, for instance from faith and Christian experience, and from the personality of the preacher, yet the Scriptures are its quickening soul and directing norm. In the former relation the sermon is sacrificial in its nature, but in the latter it is sacramental, because it is the declaration of the sin-forgiving, lifegiving grace of God in Christ. Both together make it a living unity, for there is found an interpretation of God's Word, the work of Christian experience, and the utterance of personal faith. Reduced to its kernel, the sermon in the Lutheran church is sacramental in character, there is the emphasis of forgiveness of sins, the Lord taking the office of the preacher.

Usually the sermon is based upon the lessons for the day. This is not of necessity, for the minister is free to preach whatever his spirit prompts him to give. In using other than the lessons for the day care should be exercised not to destroy the harmony and unity of the service. I am a firm believer in the use of the pericopes. They give our people the great advantage of the vital truths of the Christian life and experience. The important events in the life of Christ are fully portrayed annually before the congregation. These lessons always give one a subject on which to preach. This is a great thing, and saves many precious mornings, which otherwise would be spent in feverish search for that preaching subject. Sundays come with amazing rapidity one after another. It is a help and comfort always to have an

1 Quoted from Edward T. Horn, *Outlines of Liturgics*, p. 38.

appropriate theme ready for homiletic mastery. When one has used the regular Gospels and Epistles, there are those Lectionaries of Thomasius, Hanover and Eisenach to cover many years of preaching, as well as the appointed lessons from the Old Testament. Using the same set of lessons every Sunday year after year, would lend to monotony for me, and would seem to leave vast areas of Scripture neglected.

There are those who feel that to preach on assigned passages surely would cramp their style and freedom. But it is good discipline to preach on lessons other than one's own selection. One avoids the pitfall of the favorite topic, and requires some genuine mental exertion as well. But we must seek to make these lessons fresh and interesting. Bishop Quale of the Methodist Church had a favorite phrase: "The sin of being uninteresting is in a preacher an exceedingly mortal sin. It hath no forgiveness."² Remember, timely preaching is short; timeless preaching is eternal!

In many liturgical churches not much emphasis is placed upon the sermon, for worship is found in all the other elements of the service. But in our own Lutheran church the preaching of the Word is central and nothing supercedes it. Here is to be found a happy medium between the Catholic and Protestant views of the nature, purpose, and function of the sermon. The Catholic believer is altar-conscious in all his worship; most Protestants are only pulpit conscious, placing all emphasis on the sermon, and regarding all that has gone before as mere "preliminaries." We Lutherans appreciate both, giving each due regard, not minimizing the importance of preaching. The place of the sermon is after the Creed in connection with the Lectionaries, as Luther had it in his German Mass of 1526. Preceded by a hymn, to prepare the hearts of the people for the preaching of the Word, the Lutheran minister has the proper atmosphere for his message. God's word of truth can flow through him, and the congregation is in a receptive mood to hear it. No more fitting conclusion can be expressed than is found in the Votum, "The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus."

Much can be said in favor of the Lutheran sermon. Very few of our preachers have fallen into the habit of sensational sermons or of employing various tricks to attract attention. They do not make a vaudeville show of the pulpit. Occasionally, a few of our men will do the "popular" thing and receive wide publicity, but such action is not highly regarded by our church. In times past the one important fault of the Lutheran sermon was its sameness. It was uninteresting; it presented no new viewpoints, nothing that the people did not know already, nothing that would help them with current problems. It was full of platitudes and more platitudes. A recent conversation with one of our younger theological professors suggests that the thought-

2 William A. Quale: *The Pastor-Preacher*, p. 124.

forms of much Lutheran preaching are archaic, applicable to the Victorian era. Much more the need for freshness and imagination in our present preaching. A certain woman of our church who was known to attend other churches said that her pastor never said anything that she did not know before. "We learned," she added, "the great truths of Christianity in the Catechism and in the Sunday school and no one doubts them. To reiterate them over and over, with never a new idea, is like telling me the sun is bright and the grass is green."³ This may not have been an entirely fair criticism, but there is plenty of truth in it. Today there is much greater variety in sermon themes coming from Lutheran pulpits.

The Lutheran church is known as a church where the gospel is preached. Perhaps our conservatism has been a great help in keeping us from book sermons, current events, symphonic sermons, etc. In the true sense of preaching as related to the Word these are not sermons, and using them in the pulpit is not preaching. There are opportunities for lighter sermonic material in the second service of the day. There may be places where we use the fireside chats, forum discussion, the interpretation of great literature, and travel talks, but when so doing a Lutheran clergyman will know and honestly say that he is not preaching. The fact that the Gospel Lessons are more familiar than the Epistle Lessons shows that the Gospels for the day are usually preached upon. Ours is a gospel preaching church.

II. OUR PREACHING

The preacher's message is unchanged and unchangeable. It is true that the gospel is an eternal gospel, from everlasting to everlasting, the overture of God to men in Jesus Christ. Our preaching must always exalt Christ. He is our Gospel and He is "the same yesterday, today and forever." But it is also true that the point of challenge for faith moves as the years move, and that in each generation the immutable Gospel wears some new time-aspect. It is the old gospel in a new age, with its new emphasis. Isaiah's age needed from him an alternate warning and pleading before its pagan statescraft. Ezekiel was intent on rebuilding a broken altar. Matthew saw the children of Israel blind to the fulfillment of the promise in their midst, and bade them open their eyes. John proclaimed to the world that the Logos was made flesh. The swift passing world discovers in the abiding truth new meanings and undreamed-of treasures.

Since the Reformation each century can be said to have made a distinct contribution to Christian doctrine as a result of neglected truths. The message of the preacher in Luther's day was the doctrine of Justification by Faith. It asserted that the believer had the right of individual access to God, and

3 Henry W. Elson: Plain Talks, p. 22.

declared that the God of the Bible is not imprisoned in a hierarchy. The Puritan Revival, in the seventeenth century, was the result of religious and social conditions which brought forth the truth of the Divine Sovereignty of God as the doctrine greatly needed. In the eighteenth century John and Charles Wesley began their revival in England and America with the doctrine of Personal Salvation and Witness of the Spirit. The last century in this country gave us the preaching of Charles G. Finney, through which many were brought to the altar of God with the doctrine of Man's Free Agency and the Personalizing of Guilt. The close of the Civil War found our nation divided and torn asunder. God brought forth beloved Dwight L. Moody, with the message of His eternal redeeming love. Will there be a new note from our twentieth century to summarize our age? Surely the vast surgings of this day should be for the preacher a summons to a new urgency. A multitude of people are hungry of heart, confused, adrift, and our preaching does not meet their need. The message for today must ever be the old, eternal gospel in its wonder; the gospel that stirred the souls of Luther, Wesley and Francis; the gospel of God interpreted in terms of the thought and need of these changed times. It does not mean that the gospel will be trimmed to the fads and fashions of thought in our age, since to be up to date today is to be out of date tomorrow. It means that the gospel will show itself today, as in all other ages, able to live and triumph amid vast changes and unimagined developments of life and thought.

Preaching that gospel, we say that our preaching is essentially Biblical. The Lutheran movement in the United States has been affected very little by the historical and literary criticism of the Bible. It holds a unique allegiance to the Word of God as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. As Miles Krumbine says, "it does not take very seriously Luther's own rather free handling of the Scripture."⁴ Being perhaps the most theological minded of the Protestant denominations, Lutherans have always made doctrinal preaching prominent. The great doctrines of our faith have been so held up to our congregations that our people are not swayed by every theological wind that blows. This largely accounts for our denominational consciousness and the evident loyalty of our people.

In type of preaching our church in America reflects much of present-day Protestantism. There was a time when the Lutheran sermon was largely expository but this is not true today. Many of our men have gone in for topical preaching, with lessened strength in the pulpit. I presume that our preaching is much more textual than topical, although a survey of published sermons by different Lutheran preachers makes classification difficult. The more conservative groups of our church have stood by expository preaching. This is the pulpit's greatest need. Topical preaching is easier, freer, but

4 Miles H. Krumbine: *American Lutheran Preaching*, p. 17.

is likely to become trivial with the passing themes of the day. Textual preaching is much better, for it carries the authority of the Word, can be summarized in a single sentence, and the hearers are more likely to remember one central idea. Textual preaching must have its foundation in a correct exposition of the text, and therefore is in a sense expository.

In being true to the Word, our ideal should be expository preaching. We take for granted what amount of Scripture our people know. Knowledge of the Bible cannot be given by textual preaching, but must come by the unfolding and application of long passages of it. No doubt it is the most difficult kind of preaching to do well. It need not be dull or uninteresting. Dr. Harry F. Baughman in his *Zimmerman Lectures on Effective Preaching* gives us this splendid interpretation:

It can be made most vital. For in its ideal form it is an eager inquiry into the meaning of great passages which record the deep experiences of men to whom God was the Great Reality. It is the search to discover the whole truth of Scripture, its broad intent and revelation. It is the effort to lay hold upon that which is vital in the world. The preacher studies the passage from every possible viewpoint, history, literature, critical scholarship, and endeavors to appreciate all the elements which were involved in the making of that religious experience, the producing of that spiritual insight, out of which came this record. The word then lives for him. And he interprets it and applies it to the life which his hearers live in terms which touch their experience.⁵

There is sufficient diversity in the church to find men who are evangelistic preachers, doctrinal preachers, expository preachers, literary preachers, and even stadium preachers.

Our men have not been interested in social issues, politics and economic movements, but have confined themselves in preaching to the promotion of the individual gospel for all men. To magnify the Christ and Him crucified has been the aim of the Lutheran pulpit. It is true that Jesus worked largely with individuals, but he also spoke often of the Kingdom and he was interested in larger issues. There is an individual application of the gospel and also a social. In our aversion to the antagonistic theory of the social gospel we have ruled out of our thought and life much that is thoroughly Christian and therefore good. There is a growing social consciousness among the younger Lutheran clergy. They are anxious that the church take a stand on some of the great issues of the day. The social teachings of Jesus cannot be ignored so as to leave His message in a vacuum, shorn of its revolutionary meaning. Jesus had much to say against the evils of his day. His ethics must be applied to our generation in the large sense, which means an application to all of life. It is my firm conviction

5 *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Vol. VIII (Oct. 1935), pp. 356-57.

that no messenger of God can ignore these social implications of the gospel. His oneness of spirit with his Master must impel him to war unceasingly with every force that degrades personality and denies the role of God in human life. The church has a message to the employer when he exploits his employees; the church has a message to its members on the right of property and economic security; the church has a message to the nation in her desire to rid its life of crime; and the church has a message to the government in time of war, that the shedding of blood is contrary to the laws of God and the ideal of love and brotherhood found in Jesus Christ. If the results have been so slow in coming after two thousand years of preaching, cannot we see that, to grasp the larger vision of things to come, we preachers must preach on these matters? Listen to Dr. Paul E. Scherer in this pertinent paragraph:

This gospel to individuals operates socially. 'If the emphasis on the social at the expense of the individual yields a corpse,' says E. Stanley Jones, 'then the emphasis on the individual at the expense of the social yields a ghost.' And that is the other side of the picture. We who are Lutherans especially, I think, need to be confronted with it. We are inclined by the very genius of our inheritance to stress as I have stressed the point and focus of the gospel in the life of the individual Christian. We see clearly that he is at the centre of it, along with Christ. But we sometimes forget that his very worth and being as an individual, as a person, are betrayed and cancelled again and again by the order in which we live. We are so fast wedded, some of us, to the political status quo, and to all its privileges, that we find ourselves, more often than not, uncritically, almost instinctively, resisting change and holding back against the pressure of the new as new.⁶

It has been my privilege to hear no little preaching in the church. Some of it has been poor, some of it has occasionally been great, and much of it has been good preaching. The published sermon collections of our men, when the sermons are not by one individual, are of a high order. When one remembers the educational standards of our church, with ninety-four per cent of our clergy with college and seminary training, standing highest of any denominational group, we ought to have men in the pulpits of the Lutheran church of whom the church is rightly proud. Our preaching exalts Christ, is centered in the Word, has sufficient variety today, and comes from a highly trained clergy. It is my honest conviction, that measured as a whole, the preaching from our pulpits is as fine as any church in the land. Which leads me to a troublesome query. Why are our men not recognized? Why does not the Lutheran church have preachers who are widely known in American Protestantism?

6 Quoted from the Zimmerman Lectures of 1937.

III. WHERE ARE OUR GREAT PREACHERS?

In his volume of sermons by clergymen of the United Lutheran Church, Editor Miles Krumbine says, "The Lutheran Church in America, in common with other denominations, has had its great preachers. This is no less than one would expect when one recalls that, in Germany particularly Lutheranism has produced a succession of very great preachers. It is not to be supposed that the preaching art died out with the crossing of the Atlantic." But our men are not generally recognized. There has been that embarrassing moment in interdenominational groups, when we have been asked, "Who are your great Lutheran preachers today?" In popular polls to choose the peers of the American pulpit no Lutheran has ever been represented. As a church we have been the great unknown. Why should this be?

That the preachers of Lutheranism have not been as well known as those of other denominations is due to three factors, as I see it. The first of these is the language difficulty. Ours is a great world church, with stations in many countries and missionary enterprises all over the globe. In America much of the best preaching in the early days was done in German. A sermonic literature in a foreign tongue would hardly be expected to flourish in our country. The stubbornness of our forefathers in refusing to adopt the English language is a story too sad to be told here, but it put us down as a foreign church, and brought huge losses with each rising generation. Today the gospel is preached from the Lutheran pulpit among various language groups in our own land, in at least thirty different tongues. That difficulty is passing with the increasing adoption of the English language as a medium of pulpit utterance in all bodies of Lutherans.

The second inhibiting influence is more important. Our church has always exalted the pastoral function of the minister in a unique way. The ideal held up to the young theological student has been that of the shepherd who ministers to and cares for his flock. A man in that office is never called "Minister" but "Pastor." We are rightly proud of this title and emphasis, but it makes preaching only one phase of the office and perhaps not the most important. Whereas Luther stressed preaching with characteristic vehemence, as he was himself a very great preacher, the subsequent development of Lutheranism along confessional and liturgical lines hardly left room for the development of preaching as a unique achievement. More recently, however, renewed emphasis has come to be placed on the preaching work of the minister. Young Lutheran students are seeking the great centers of learning here and abroad, with the definite intention of equipping themselves more adequately for a larger place in the pulpit leadership of America.

The third factor why our men are not better known is the most important of all. It is our aloofness. We have hidden our light under a bushel.

There are some narrow men among us who think that Christ came for the Lutheran church. They refer to the great bodies of Protestants as "the sects;" but the habit is passing. One of our most difficult problems has been to decide how far we should hold religious fellowship with other Protestant bodies. Many of our Lutheran men have held themselves aloof from fellowship, only to be ignored. It has done us little good. How often have we heard a speaker refer to other denominations by name, and never mention our church. American Lutheranism today pays this penalty. The only recognized association of fellowship is the consultative relationship which the United Lutheran Church holds with the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. For this we are severely criticized by other Lutheran bodies. Fortunately for our church, there is a rising generation who believe in cooperation. We have been the great unknown in times past because we have not allowed ourselves to be known. Is there any great virtue in obscurity? Surely the third largest Protestant body in this land should be better known.

It was interesting to see how completely we were ignored in the recent volume, *Sermon Hearts from the Gospels*, compiled by Wm. H. Leach. There ought to be more sermons taken from the Gospels in the Lutheran church than in any other, yet as far as I know only one Lutheran could be found among the many sermons quoted. The compiler had completely missed our two-volume publication, *Gospel Preaching for the Day*, which includes over one hundred sermons from our clergymen. Correspondence with Editor Leach gives me the information that our Publication House ignored his request for any books from Lutheran sources and consequently we were not represented.

In a splendidly written book published in 1933, Dr. Edgar DeWitt Jones gives an intimate appraisal of thirty-two leaders of the American Pulpit, entitled *American Preachers Of Today*. Dr. Jones is himself a gifted preacher and writer, and is qualified to accomplish well the task in hand. I know of no more interesting volume on contemporary preachers and preaching. Here is to be found a gallery of vivid portraits. It is a broad selection, embracing Protestant, Catholic and Jew, Fundamentalist and Modernist. Here one finds the truly great names of the pulpit today. Not one Lutheran is to be found among the thirty-two. In an introductory chapter a few names from each denomination are listed. Is it not significant that in a book of over three hundred pages, written beautifully of thirty-two leaders Dr. Jones completely missed us?

A new departure in religious book publishing was Harper's *Monthly Pulpit*. Never before in the history of the American pulpit have so many volumes of sermons been published in a series, the number being fifty-one in all. In keeping with the demand for the best available sermon literature

in permanent form, they issued once each month a selection of the finest sermons of an outstanding preacher. Each book contained ten selected by the author as typical of his preaching. Most of the men represented should be called "liberal" in thought and outlook. The list of those whose sermons were published would make a large roster of the great names of the American pulpit. The volume for December 1934, *When God Hides*, by Paul E. Scherer is the only one by a Lutheran and was one of the most popular in the series. Here we are at least represented, even if it be by the ratio of fifty to one. Dr. Scherer's metropolitan pulpit in New York City, his years abroad, and his "Sunday Vespers" over the air, all have carried his voice and message to the world. There are other excellent Lutheran preachers, and many good ones, who are not well known, but nonetheless render excellent service in the pulpit. Perhaps better known among Lutherans than among other denominations is Dr. Walter A. Maier, professor of Semitic languages and Old Testament interpretation and history in Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri. As preacher for "The Lutheran Hour," sponsored by the Missouri Synod, he has spoken each Sunday over the air to more listeners than many of us have in a lifetime. Hundreds of thousands of letters have been received testifying to the vigorous, powerful, Gospel preaching of this man.

Let me make myself clear on this point. We should not strive for great preaching. Occasionally the Holy Spirit may inspire the poorest of us to preach a masterful sermon. The emphasis should be placed on good preaching rather than great; on strong preaching that is inspiring to produce some excellent fruitage. There should be many good preachers among us, and a very few will rise to the heights of greatness by native gifts and sheer application to duty. We have the liturgical service, we appreciate the appointments for worship, including music and architecture. Let us not smother the prophetic office of excellent preaching, but make it supreme in the service and then our worship will be acceptable to God and helpful to men.

A longsuffering layman spoke thus to Dr. Ernest Fremont Tittle concerning his preacher, "He has been with us three years, and he is a nice fellow and we all like him; but so far as his pulpit ministry is concerned, the last two years have been very unprofitable. He has brought no fresh insight to his task. Before he even so much as opens his mouth, we know in substance what he is going to say. He runs round and round in the little circle of ideas in which he was moving when he first came to us. And the congregation is beginning to dwindle."⁸ Of course it is beginning to dwindle; and unless there is a change in the pulpit, it will go on dwindling almost to the vanishing point. Here is a nice fellow, but with nothing to say. To have

7 *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

8 Ernest Fremont Tittle: *The Foolishness of Preaching*, p. 305.

something to say that is worth saying Sunday after Sunday is no small task, but it must be done. To ask any preacher to produce one helpful sermon each week, year in and year out, is not asking too much. Most of us will agree that to produce two sermons each week is too much. It simply cannot be done in the light of the multitudinous tasks we face. Better admit the fact and preach one good sermon a week rather than two poor ones.

Would that the congregation could understand what is required of the preacher to do effective preaching. Our men are too busy with administrative, executive and pastoral duties to do excellent preaching. One of the best young preachers in our church told me not so long ago, while in the process of doing some church building, that he had to get up his sermon on Saturday afternoon when all activity had ceased, in order to be prepared for Sunday. This is contrary to all that is right, but even with helpful assistants he was unable to save his mornings for sermonic preparation, and he is very strong in the pulpit. Our people do not respect our requests for relief from telephone calls and interviews during the morning's study period, when often these calls could be made just as well at lunch time or in the early afternoon. Many of our men are discouraged, for the tension of life and the demands by our people and by officials in the church bring one to the breaking point. Sermon preparation is the most difficult task of all, is oftentimes the first neglected, and the result is ineffective preaching.

IV. IN THE SEMINARY

There is more or less agreement that the training in homiletics and preaching in our seminaries has been inadequate. The increasing demands for more time and more courses in the curriculum have been heavy, and the task is of a large order even to lay a foundation in theological science for the young student. Three short years of eight or nine months are not sufficient time to go into any of the subjects of study thoroughly. The seminary training is but an entrance into what ought to be a lifetime of fruitful study. It is not my purpose to blame the seminaries for all our faults and foibles today. It is expecting a good deal of them to turn out much of a finished product in the time allotted and with the material at hand. Sometimes we are woefully unfair to our institutions of learning in our expectations and criticisms; but in the field of preaching most of our Lutheran seminaries have not been fair to us.

Just fifteen years ago this month I preached my first sermon. Though I had been accustomed to public performance in music, dramatics, oratory and debate, it was a memorable occasion, if for no one but myself. In thinking back over these all-too-quickly passing years I ask myself how well did I learn to preach in Seminary? Did my course fit me not only in theoretical studies, but in the art of biblical expression? How much time was given

us to preach in the classroom? We had as students a course in the history of preaching, a survey course in the work of preaching for the first year. The second year (after we had been supplying churches for the vacation season), we learned of texts, themes and outlines. The third year was practice preaching before the class, where for our small group we each preached the round twice in turn. If our class had been large we should have had to content ourselves with only one opportunity, and I have heard it said that it has been known for a senior not to have had the opportunity at all. This negligible amount of experience is tragic. There was not a single elective course for those men gifted and ambitious in preaching. And this was only a few years ago.

Did we learn to preach in Seminary? Well—hardly! We had a sufficient basis of instruction upon which to build a foundation for our pulpit work. This I maintain is not enough. Those men who achieved any pulpit distinction in the past have done so on their own initiative. It is true that in preaching we learn by doing, and we were thrown on our own resources to sink or swim. But when a man finishes his theological instruction and seeks a call he is expected to be able to preach acceptably. He is a finished product in the eyes of the people who hear him, and they judge him by his speech and actions. Has he not graduated from the Seminary and is he not therefore ready to preach? After five years of active ministry in another state, I had the privilege to return to a parish in Pennsylvania, and on one occasion to speak briefly to the students of the Seminary at Gettysburg. My first word to them was about their preaching ministry. Among a maze of things, one must choose; and no better choice could be made than to strive for pulpit excellency. My other thought was the hope that the Seminary would lay greater stress upon preaching.

This subject came up for discussion not so long ago at one of the meetings of the theological professors of the United Lutheran seminaries. After some consideration and discussion, the consensus of opinion seemed to be that improvement had taken place. The Philadelphia Seminary Bulletin describes three prescribed courses, with four electives and two seminars, in the department of Practical Theology. The course in practice preaching mentions five or more sermons preached by each student; each sermon is discussed in class, and personal interviews supplement the classroom discussion. The work of preaching at the Gettysburg Seminary is being organized in a special department, with the primary purpose of effective preaching, every student composing and delivering sermons each term of each year. Both of these institutions have shown commendable improvement in this department of seminary work. The president of one of our Lutheran seminaries at this meeting stated that either a man could preach or he could not, much of it being a native gift, and that no amount of training could make a man a preacher without certain talent for it. There is much truth in this thought.

Yet the Seminary can train each and every student in the fundamentals of preaching so well that he can correct faults and develop to a certain degree of proficiency, even if he will never be a great pulpit master.

Our students in times past have needed a greater opportunity for expression and experience. In addition to student devotionals, there might be a weekly Vesper service with sermon by a senior student each week in the seminary year. It is encouraging to note how our seminaries are making room for more student preaching today. There should be ample opportunity for those who would major in this field to do so. We cannot estimate the value to the church of even one great preacher, and encouragement should be offered those who are ambitious to excel in this work. A class of excellent young preachers reflects great credit upon the institution from whence they come and the professor who trained them. What higher privilege can come to a man than the opportunity to train scores of consecrated young ministers in the prophetic office of the truth of God's Word?

The hearing of much excellent preaching is a great help to the young preacher. Such advantages are ample in the metropolitan center, and if not so in some quarters, that advantage should be made.

Mention should be made in closing of the Dr. and Mrs. Jeremiah Zimmerman Lectures on Effective Preaching, delivered annually at the Gettysburg Seminary. This is one of the distinct and precious possessions of that institution. Dr. Robert Fortenbaugh interprets the gift in these words:

I hope to have your pardon for saying that the establishment of this lectureship was not a great surprise to me when I remembered the many occasions upon which I heard Dr. Zimmerman lament the ineffectiveness of much modern preaching, particularly in the Lutheran church. Not questioning the consecration or the piety of many preachers, he did contend that two things were lacking in the equipment of all too many of them, viz., a broad basis or background of culture and understanding of life, and effective expression. These, he believed, together with an evident depreciation of the value of preaching by some preachers themselves, were responsible for too much ineffective preaching.⁹

What a fitting benefaction, to endow a lectureship for which there was a genuine need, giving students for generations to come the opportunity of hearing great masters of the pulpit on the art of preaching.

Preaching is not decadent today. There never was a day when there was so much great preaching. It never had a greater opportunity. The same is true of our Lutheran church. In justice to the preaching from her pulpits, it must be said that there are scores, if not hundreds, of her preachers who do effective preaching. Each general body of Lutherans in America has a few men widely known among them. A few of these men are known

9 Quoted from *The Gettysburg Seminary Bulletin*, August 1937.

to all Lutherans, and a very few to a wider circle of Protestants. Let us all who carry the sacred trust, resolve to preach God's Word with power to a sinful world. The Lutheran church in America may be expected to produce its full quota of good preachers in the oncoming generations.

LUTHER'S MUSICAL EDUCATION AND ACTIVITIES

ULRICH LEUPOLD

Kitchener, Ontario

IT IS a curious fact that the very great theologians in the history of the church generally were also good musicians. Ambrose, bishop of Milan about 400, introduced hymn-singing into the Western church and was the author of many Latin hymns. Augustine, his disciple, was enthusiastically fond of music and wrote five volumes entitled, *De Musica*. Pope Gregory I, about the year 600, reorganized liturgical singing so thoroughly that it bears his name to this day. Zwingli, the reformer of Switzerland, played nearly every musical instrument known in his day with perfection. Schleiermacher, the German theologian at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and originator of theological liberalism, was extremely fond of music and devoted many of his writings to it. But Luther surpasses all these men in his conception of church music as well as in his musical genius. This statement may be elucidated best if we review briefly his musical education and activities.

Music was one of the main objectives in school education in the period when Luther grew up. The abundance of religious services celebrated in the Medieval church demanded many trained choirs. While the mass occasionally could be celebrated by a priest and a ministrant, the horary prayers had to be performed by a choir. As today there are many sport-clubs everywhere in this country, baseball teams, yacht-clubs, tennis-clubs, etc., so in every Medieval town there were many church choral societies. Groups of citizens joined these choirs and obligated themselves for certain church services in their city. But the largest share of this work always rested upon the shoulders of the school children, or to be more exact, the school boys, since the girls got hardly any schooling before the Reformation. From the very beginning of their schooling the boys were trained in music, learning the psalms, responsories, introits, hymns, etc., mostly by heart. Thus a single school often had two, three, or even more choirs. Of these choirs the so-called *Kurrende* was most eagerly aspired to by the pupils, because membership in this choir gave boys an opportunity to earn their living. Its main purpose was to allow poor boys to attend school, this being a luxury at that time. The *Kurrende*

had a twofold obligation. It had to provide the music for the extensive Matins that were held at three and six o'clock in the morning and it had to go in procession through the streets, singing chorales and collecting alms from kind hearted people. Many citizens even subscribed a fixed sum to have certain songs sung before their doors or to have services sung for dead relatives. Generally the Kurrende also had to provide the funeral music, accompanying the funeral procession from the dead person's house to the cemetery. Day and night these poor lads walked around singing in chilly churches and muddy streets, clothed with special grey cloaks and carrying sacks on their shoulders to collect their food. Their life surely was not very comfortable, and often their hoarse singing was more derided than appreciated.

Without a doubt Luther got his first musical training in the elementary school in Mansfeld, where his parents lived. When he left his parents' home to attend school in Magdeburg and later on in Eisenach, he became a member of the Kurrende in both places. In Eisenach he happened to win the affection of Frau Ursula Cotta, with his excellent voice. This wealthy woman took him into her home. In later days Luther often recalled his service as a Kurrende boy. Once he said with regard to the Kurrende: "Don't look down upon these lads. I was one of them. These are the right ones that go around in mended cloaks and boots; they often become the most learned and noble men."

In 1501 Luther entered the University of Erfurt. As in school life, so in the university lectures of this period, music played a rather important part. It belonged to the so-called *Artes Liberales*, and every student had to receive a thorough training in the theory of music before he could get the diploma of a bachelor that entitled him to choose a special faculty. During the Middle Ages music theory consisted to a great extent in forwarding the musical teachings of antiquity which were somewhat adapted to the contemporary status of music; and in Luther's day the humanistic movement had just begun to modernize this science and to revitalize it. At any rate, Luther may have learned the acoustical basis of the system of church tones, its aesthetic meaning, and the rudiments of composing, if not even more than this. We are told by his friend, Matthaeus Ratzeberger that Luther was quite able to correct a misprint when he occasionally found one in the music that he sang with his friends at home. Correcting a misprint demanded a more than average musical education, because, at that time the polyphonic music was never published in score, but always in parts. Other records prove that he was able also to complete musical settings, add new voices, or compose new settings, to say nothing about his profound appreciation of the masters of his time.

But we have to turn back to Luther the student. Erfurt was one of the centers of the humanistic movement. In this period scholars rediscovered

the beauty of the old Latin poetry. So Luther learned both to appreciate Virgil and Horace and to write and compose poems in similar style. Writing Latin poems and setting them to music was then considered very modern and proved rather influential on the development of the Protestant chorale later on.

Probably in this connection Luther learned to play the lute, which was to the people of Luther's day what the piano is to us. It was played by every educated person, either as a solo instrument or for singing accompaniment. Every sort of vocal music, motets as well as secular songs, was transcribed for the lute, and we find many old hand-written lute books, used as albums with drawings, emblems, verses and other souvenirs. At the courts of the princes we even find women of doubtful character singing songs with lute accompaniment. The lute was to secular music what the organ was in church music. And Luther practiced on this instrument all his life. The spread of the lute may be learned from a story that Luther himself told in his Table Talks: "When I was a young monk I once celebrated mass in one of those villages where the priest was paid in cheese for his services. After I had robed and stepped up to the altar, the custodian began to play the Kyrie Eleison and Credo on the lute. I could hardly keep from bursting into laughter, for I was not accustomed to such organ-playing. So I had to adapt my Gloria in Excelsis to his Kyrie."

In 1505 Luther entered the monastery of the Augustinians in Erfurt. While the University increased his knowledge of all branches of secular music, the monastic life gave him the final training in Gregorian singing. Seven times a day all the friars gathered for the singing of the horary prayers. Antiphons, psalms, hymns, responsories, and canticles formed the most important musical parts of these services. As a probationer Luther received a full course of this music and was taught whatever he had not learned before as a choir boy. The significance of this monastic musical training for Luther's musical ability can hardly be overestimated. He learned both to appreciate the beauty of Gregorian music and to despise its abuse in the mechanical and compulsory bawling of the monks' choir. As often as he praised music in his later years, he condemned the senseless singing in the monasteries.

A famous picture represents Luther in the circle of his family playing and singing with his children and friends. We know that music never ceased to be an important part of his daily life. After dinner his sons Martin and Paul would sing the responsories for the day of the church year. Luther used to bring the parts of the music from his study in order to sing with his friends. He himself had a small but well trained tenor voice. He used to sing the alto, which voice at this time usually was performed by high male voices.

The profound power which music had over Luther is seen in an incident which Ratzeberger records. Lucas Edenberger, the music teacher at the court once came with some of his companions to visit Luther. Finding that he had fainted in his study, they succeeded in awakening him by their music. Luther finally recovered and joined their singing, entreating them to visit him whenever they wanted to, since music evidently helped him against temptation and melancholy. There is no reason to look upon this story as just a legend. Luther gave the same advice to other people who poured out their afflictions before him. For example he wrote to Matthias Weller, an organist in Freiberg, Saxony: "If you feel gloomy and things become too much for you, just say: 'Well, I shall play a song for our Lord Christ on the regal (organ) be it *Te Deum* or *Benedictus*; for Scripture teaches me that He likes to hear singing and playing.' And strike briskly the keys and sing until your speculations cease, as David and Elisha did." But this deep emotional influence of music by no means extinguished his humorous vein. Three months later he wrote to the same musician: "We sing as well as we can after meals. While we do mix in some blunders, it is not your fault, our ability yet being rather deficient, even if we practice it two or three times. . . . Therefore you composers should pardon us if we make blunders in your songs, since we would prefer to strike rather than miss the right note."

His favorite composer was Josquin de Près, the famous Belgian composer, who died in 1521. He praised the natural flow of his music, and coined the statement about him that he made the notes go as *he* would, while all the other composers had to let the notes go as *they* would. But Luther also kept in touch with a number of the most able composers of his time. Many of them visited Wittenberg in order to see him. At that time it frequently happened that men changed from the profession of precentor to the ministry or vice versa. Especially in school life the precentor had not only to teach music, but Latin, Greek, and the Catechism as well. He ranked immediately after the rector as the second highest official in the school.

Very interesting are Luther's relations with Ludwig Senfl, the ablest German composer at this time, who worked at the court in Munich, Bavaria. During the Diet of Augsburg in 1530 Luther lived at Fort Coburg, following the negotiations from afar with disgust and sorrow. In his mournful mood he addressed personally the revered musician, praising the art of music in general and specially asking him to arrange the antiphon, *In pace in id ipsum*, "I will both lay me down in peace and sleep: for thou, Lord, only makest me dwell in safety" (Ps. 4:8), for many voices. He writes: "This melody has comforted me from boyhood and still more now that I understand the words. . . . I hope that the end of my life is at hand. The world hates and doesn't like me, and I in turn am disgusted with the world and despise it. Therefore may the Good Shepherd take away my soul. For this reason I

sing this song more frequently; but I would like to have it in a setting. . . ." Twenty years later visitors to the fort still saw this melody written with chalk on the wall in Luther's study. Senfl complied with Luther's request in a splendid way. He sent a motet, but he chose as his text another of Luther's favorite verses, *Non moriar sed vivam*, "I shall not die, but live, and declare the works of the Lord" (Ps. 118:17), to be followed by the requested "In Pace" later on. His sympathy for the Reformation may have cost him his position if not his head in the strictly Catholic court in Munich. The records of his later years suddenly cease, and we know nothing about the circumstances of his death. Later on Luther composed his own setting for four voices of the antiphon, "Non Moriar," that strikingly displays his musical ability.

It is impossible to trace the circumstances of all the musicians with whom Luther was in touch. It would be well to become acquainted with some of the fine characters of the Reformation and to get an impression of how the great events of that period determined the fate of the individual man. I cannot avoid mentioning three of them who worked together very closely with Luther for a longer period of time. I refer to Johannes Walter, Conrad Rupsch and Georg Rhau.

When Luther after his return from the Wartburg, began his work of practical reform in church life, Walter and Rupsch were members of the court chapel of the elector Friedrich der Weise at Torgau, Saxony, Walter as a singer and composer, and Rupsch as a choir director. In 1525 Luther had these two men stay in Wittenberg for three weeks, during which time he conferred with them about the musical arrangement of the German Mass, which he published in 1526. We are given a careful record of these preparations by Johann Walter, who from that time functioned as the intimate musical friend and adviser of Luther. Beginning with his *Wittenbergisch geistliches Gesangbuechlein* (Wittenberg Sacred Hymnal) of 1524, Walter composed the first choir music of the Reformation, a fine series of valuable church music that was widely used during the Reformation and gave a solid and ideal basis for the whole development of Lutheran church music. He is to be compared only with Georg Rhau, a man who could claim the title of the musical organizer of Protestantism. In 1519 when Luther carried on his disputation with the Catholic scholar Eck in Leipzig, Rhau inaugurated this event with a mass for twelve voices, his own composition. As a precentor at St. Thomas' Church, Leipzig, he was an early link in the splendid chain formed by the predecessors of J. S. Bach. The debate he witnessed evidently made him an adherent of Luther. Two decades later we find him in Wittenberg as a music publisher. In close collaboration with Luther he put out a splendid series of musical collections to fill the needs of the evangelical schools and churches. The importance of Rhau's publication house for the development of Lutheran church music can hardly be overestimated. His

publications witness in a threefold sense to the best spirit of Lutheran church music. Primarily they are built up entirely in accordance with the principles of the Reformation and are especially fitted for the liturgical use in the evangelical services. Second, they prove to be on the highest musical level, giving a large choice of the best composers of this time. And last, but not least, they are outstanding in the careful editing of the whole, and in the printing itself.

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS

A Testament of Faith. By P. G. S. Hopwood. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1939. xii, 215 pages. \$2.

This is a recent volume in the Great Issues of Life Series, edited by Rufus M. Jones. It is called a Testament of Faith. Its thesis is that faith is needed to guide the seeker along the pathways to ultimate reality.

This thesis is discussed not to meet issues of the past but of the living present. Materialism is not the present issue though there still remain some survivals of it. However, where it does survive it is a question whether matter is not endowed with such spiritual properties that it can hardly be equated with 19th Century materialism. The present issue is psychological—the Freudian new psychology that would look on God as only the carry-over of infantile complexes which the learned are thought to have outgrown. This is the vital issue of the present and, after stating it, the author devotes the book to answering the same.

The answer does not attempt to be original but brings together in brief compass and simple statement what theists and believers in religion have been saying. Thus we have proper emphasis on faith and a very definite faith in forgiveness and redemption as necessities for an integrated life. While dwelling on such integration he does not however, after the manner of some, equate God with such integration and thus doubt whether God is personal or not. Rather he looks on the integration as requiring us to believe in a Unity of Mind, a Personal God, who gives this Unity. Order and thought in the universe require a Divine Mind. Faith in such an order appears both in the feeling of the mystic, in the thinking of theism, and in the activities which belief in God has inspired.

Large emphasis is given on what is *given* to men—the grace of God. Unless this were given we could not even be religious. Life is correspondence with environment. That environment is in its ultimate reality spiritual. It is God—"If values are of the nature of things, it means there is a supreme Mind, a supreme Heart, a supreme Will, and a supreme personality who embodies them in their perfect form. Faith can not believe that the scientists' passion for truth, the artists' appraisal of beauty, and the ethical direction of personality are negligible for the nature of ultimate reality. On the contrary, when we discover truth or act righteously we are coöperating with reality. Faith's grand projection of the values discovers them to be grounded in Divine personality, the supreme Bearer of values in their highest and ideal expression.

"Or else man must make what he can of a mutilated and chaotic universe" (pp. 203, 204). In brief, the author's standpoint is that we are in a spiritual order and have such kinship with it that we can know that order, if we have the mind of the Spirit. And such a faith has more to commend it to our best thinking than any of its substitutes.

The book is a valuable contribution not only to this series but also to theistic and Christian apologetic literature.

JOHN ABERLY

Prophecy and Divination. By Alfred Guillaume. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938. xviii, 434 pages. 20/.

This volume comprises the Bampton Lectures for 1938. Principal Guillaume is known to American readers as one of the writers in Gore's Commentary on the Holy

Scriptures. He chose as his subject *Prophecy and Religion*, which he treated under the following topics: Sumerian-Babylonian Religion, Hebrew-Arabian Religion, Divinatory Prophecy, Dreams and Visions, Magic and Sorcery, Ecstasy, and Personal Religion. Seven appended notes deal with the Prophet's View of Sacrifice, the Moon-God, Magic and Religion, Miracles, Modern Examples of Fire-Walking, Old Testament Criticism in the Eleventh Century, and *Post-eventum* Prophecies.

This is a valuable book. When a scholar of the range of Principal Guillaume treats a subject like prophecy he is likely to introduce a wealth of collateral material. There is a fine analysis of the Arab and his religion. The exegesis of the oracles of Balaam is most illuminating. One of the best studies is that of Magic. Magic is the survival of the primitive man's *Weltanschauung*. In these lectures the position is taken that the whole course of Semitic religion was thwarted and hindered by magic, and that no religion but that of the Hebrew succeeded in putting up a strong resistance to magic. The large place of the curse in Semitic literature is due to the Semitic conception of the "Word" as being a veritable emanation of the soul. The "Word" is just as potent for blessing. The Word of the Fourth Gospel is a Semitic concept. Evil spirits were very real to the Hebrews. Principal Guillaume follows Mowinckel in taking the foes of the imprecatory psalms chiefly as evil spirits. These are but a few of the collateral studies.

The thesis of the book is that prophecy belongs primarily to man's primitive life, and that therefore we are to look for primitive paraphernalia. The method of the book is inductive and it is not always easy to determine just how far the author claims a parallel between Hebrew prophecy and Mesopotamian and Arabian prophecy. We share the opinion of the reviewer in *The Expository Times* that the ecstatic elements to be found in Islam cannot be shown to have been characteristics of either early Arabian or early Hebrew prophecy, and that at bottom there is little in common between the Hebrew prophet and the Islamic dervish. The Hebrew prophet was certainly subject to an abnormal psychosis which may or may not have been accompanied by abnormal behavior. The language of the recorder of the prophetic utterances is so influenced by environment that the abnormality, from our point of view, may lie there. The evidence submitted by the author does not seem sufficient to prove a Mesopotamian or Akkadian origin of these abnormalities in conduct. On the other hand there is sufficient evidence that it is Canaanite, and the source of that, scholars are coming to believe, was Western (Anatolian) rather than Eastern. It was from Asia Minor rather than from Mesopotamia that the ecstatic elements of prophecy are to be traced. The beginnings of Hebrew prophecy shared them, but its normal development sluffed them off.

The general effect of a careful reading of this book is to enhance one's appreciation that Hebrew prophecy is unique. The parallels between Hebrew and other prophecy are more in the dress than in the soul.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN

Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels. By P. Gardner-Smith. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1939. xii, 100 pages. \$1.25.

This is one more book on the Fourth Gospel. The author of *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation* (1931) thought the time had come to classify the findings of scholars as to the origin and type of this most appealing of the Gospels, but the mining is by no means finished. We probably have not yet found the relation of John to the Synoptic Gospels. Most critics hold that John is dependent to some extent on Mark; others would add Luke, and some perhaps Matthew. Dr. Gardner-Smith re-examines the question and arrives at the conclusion that the points of contact

are negligible and the agreement so slight that a theory of literary dependence is not required. Scholars have made far too much of the few points of agreement and far too little of the conflicts. The author advances the theory of a common oral tradition, with John as an independent product. He would accordingly reduce the date, making the Gospel contemporary with Mark.

Prof. McCasland in his review in *The Christian Century* has put his finger on a weak spot in the theory. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus was openly recognized as the Messiah and so announced himself to the Samaritan woman, and went about without molestation for several years, whereas, according to Mark, on the very day that the Messianic secret got beyond the little group of chosen disciples, Jesus' doom was sealed. It would seem as if the Fourth Gospel had been written so much later that the peril of Messianic announcement had been lost sight of in the general acceptance of the Messianic fact. This difference is not fatal to the theory, but the author does not satisfy us on this point.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN

The Religion of the New Testament. By Ernest William Parsons. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1939. vii, 278 pages. \$2.50.

The author has chosen the term "religion" rather than "theology" because it is more comprehensive, more personal, and more flexible. He says that a harmonized cross section of New Testament thought called "New Testament Theology" is "merely the product of an arbitrary process." Rejecting the method of the harmonist, he interrogates the various sections of the New Testament in the light of the conditions surrounding their origin and permits them "to speak their own thoughts so far as we can recover them."

The first chapter deals with the religion of Jesus and the Kingdom of God, God, man, sin and salvation, the future, ethics, and Jesus' thought about Himself. It is written in the light of Jesus' environment, and it distinguishes, on the basis of historical and literary criticism, the religion of Jesus from the religion of the Synoptic Gospels. It is followed by a chapter on the religion of the pre-Pauline Christians, which shows the rise of the Resurrection faith and the consequent affirmation that Jesus is the Messiah, presents the primitive apologetic for the reproach of the cross, and discusses the problem of old and new in the beginnings of Christianity.

Paul's many-sided religious life is likewise described in relation to his environment, his personality, and his earlier career, under the heads of the need of redemption, the redemptive process (including Jesus' part and man's part in it), justification by faith, salvation, the attainment of salvation, sacramentalism, the consummation of salvation, religion and ethics, and the church. The chapter concludes with a section on Paul and Jesus and an estimate of the permanent and transient elements in the religion of Paul. Adequate recognition is given to the Hellenistic elements in Paul's religious experience.

Chapter five treats of the religion of the Synoptic Gospels in distinction from, and comparison with, the religion of Jesus, namely the Synoptic writers' Messianic interpretation of Jesus' person and work, their explanation of His death, their conception of the church, and their eschatology. This is followed by a chapter on the religion of the Epistle to the Hebrews which gives the general religious position of its writer in relation to the dangerous situation of Christianity in a time of persecution from without and weariness and indifference from within; it describes the remedy which was prescribed by the unknown author of the Epistle; his insistence that Christianity is the supreme revelation of God and the supreme access to God; and it compares his conceptions of faith, salvation, and ethics with those of Paul and the pre-Pauline Christians.

Chapter seven is concerned with the religion of the Apocalypse in relation to its conception of God, the Messiah and salvation, its ethics and its "millenium." There is a trenchant criticism of apocalyptic ethics and a brief but admirably clear presentation of the history of the millennial expectation which will be of great help in dealing with religious groups who tear the book out of its historical context and make it the playground of apocalyptic fancy.

The religion of the Fourth Gospel is compared with the religion of Jesus and the religion of the Synoptics and the points of contrast and development are noted. Its leading conceptions are treated in relation to its second century Hellenistic environment: life eternal and its attainment by faith and knowledge, mystical union, new birth and sacraments; and the effect of the rich and transforming religious experiences of the writer, or the group which he represented, upon the interpretation of the death of Jesus, eschatology and the Messiah, the church, the ethical life and fate and responsibility, is made clear. (The Johannine Epistles are taken to be from another than the author of the Gospel.)

In chapter nine the religion of the remaining documents of the New Testament is considered, and this is followed by a brief summary and indexes of subjects and names and Scripture references. The book is intended "primarily for Christian ministers and laymen whose interest in the New Testament is sufficiently real and vital to make them desire to know what the various writings composing that part of the Bible actually say."

One who is accustomed to think of the New Testament as a static quantum of revelation, hermetically sealed and cast into the stream of history by a more or less absentee God, will doubtless be inclined to put this book upon the Index immediately and without benefit of trial by reading. The author is not unaware that his method and point of view may raise disturbing questions as to the authoritative message of the New Testament. But he reminds his readers, in the words of Auguste Sabatier, that "Authority is never other than the power of fact," and he insists that an historical approach to the New Testament does not undermine any vital authority which it may have for us. Emphasizing a fact which is too often overlooked by critics of the historical method, he says: "In many cases such authority is more firmly established even if the foundation on which it rests is differently constructed." This is a point of utmost importance.

Suppose, for example, that our author's view could be proved to the satisfaction of every historian that Jesus did not think of Himself as the Messiah, but as a prophet, and that Messianism was attributed to Him by His followers after His death. Or again, suppose that it could be shown beyond question that there was "no transactional element in the mind of Jesus" as He went to His death, but that the ideas of penalty bearing and vicarious suffering were Paul's or some other man's interpretation of the death of Jesus, and thus their contribution to the developing Christian theology. It so happens that other historians, approaching the New Testament from the same point of view as our author, employing the same methods of research, and recognizing that "truth is never other than the power of fact," draw different conclusions as to what the facts were. But even if there were unanimous agreement among scholars that the foregoing conclusions are correct, it would by no means destroy the truth of religious experience which is the basis of the Petrine, the Pauline, and the Johannine interpretations of Jesus. Truth would still be truth, whether Jesus or Paul, or, as Luther would say, Judas himself gave utterance to it. A study such as this may mean only that the foundations on which the authority of the New Testament rests are differently, and, let us hope, more adequately understood. We shall have clarified and enriched our understanding of how God revealed Himself to man in Christ Jesus.

The New Testament, like a diamond, reflects the light of the Gospel from many angles of religious experience—this is what the present volume makes crystal clear. At the same time the reader will see with equal clarity the fundamental unity which underlies the religious experience of the writers of the New Testament. Jesus called it repentance, Paul justification by faith, the Epistle to the Hebrews access to God, the writer of the Fourth Gospel eternal life. And with it all we get a more adequate conception of the beginnings of our religion and its development from the days of Jesus to the close of the New Testament period. All of which is great gain.

R. T. STAMM

Making the Bible Live. By Georgia L. Chamberlin. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939. 384 pages. \$3.

Any book with the aim suggested by the title of this one should be welcomed. Miss Chamberlin's *Making the Bible Live* is deserving of special commendation because of the author's success in realizing this aim.

The Old Testament only is treated. The translation used is that of Smith and Goodspeed, and the historical and critical view of the composition of the Scriptures is followed. Whether the author agrees or not with Carlyle when he said, "there is no history, only biography," she has succeeded pretty well in presenting Old Testament history in terms of vivid personalities.

This work is intended for those engaged in Christian religious education—preachers, parents and others. Miss Chamberlin writes out of a rich experience as a teacher of Bible and very properly insists that not all parts of the Bible are of equal value in religious education. Genesis, it is contended, with its "folk-lore, myth, and legend," contains permanent and imperishable spiritual truth. The prophets were men of their times but also spiritual leaders who anticipated the fundamental moral demands of every age. Amos, for instance, knew and taught "that social injustice is intolerable to God, that church-going does not insure God's favor, that moral corruption separates man from God, that punishment is the inherent result of sin itself, that the breach between God and man can be mended only by a changed life."

They who are engaged in the teaching of children or the guiding of young people will find much of value here. The former will be interested in the suggested material for dramatization and the latter in the topics for discussion. The general reader will find this volume interesting and informing. It will help to make the Bible live.

W. C. WALTEMYER

The Faith We Declare. By Edwin Lewis. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1939. 236 pages. \$2.

"Jesus' metaphor of the camel and the eye of the needle has many applications; and one of them is to the Christian preacher who would recover if he has lost it, or who would discover if he never had it, that inner certainty respecting Jesus Christ as the gift of the grace of God to sinful men, the ground of the experience of pardon and peace and power, and the sure means of new life for all mankind, which is what the Gospel has always meant" (p. 194).

This is the ringing challenge which this book presents to the modern preacher. The Gospel is the epitome of the faith which is given him to declare; not "the religion of humanity;" not "the religion of Jesus;" but the religion which Jesus made possible through His coming, His deeds, His death, His resurrection, the outpouring of the

Spirit. In this Jesus, who was and is the Word of God, the redeeming power of God is offered to men.

The author calls this emphasis neo-orthodoxy. It is orthodox in that it embodies the truth which was given the church to preach and which has remained the unchanging truth through all the ages. It is new by reason of the fact that it needs to be reasserted at the present day and clothed with "contemporaneity." How this may be done is exemplified in every chapter. The temptation of the modern preacher to compromise, to deal with subjects which are only peripheral to the Gospel message, and to subordinate the religious message of the New Testament to the more immediate needs of a socially disordered world, is sympathetically but decisively dealt with. Only as the Gospel is preached can the church become the instrument of a divine redemption.

The author recognizes the contemporaneous need of a "Social Gospel," but his interpretation of the social mission of the church is in harmony with his main thesis. The "logic" of the Gospel is "evangelical, Christian missions." "It is not that the church as such is to rule the world. But it is that the church is commissioned so to proclaim the truth of Christ, so to bring men under its control, so to stand this truth in sharp contrast with every evil thing, so to engender in human hearts everywhere that love for Christ which brings also love for others, that the vision which inspired John (in Revelation) should become a reality." This faith "must be declared by every man who professes it—declared in such ways as may be possible to him. . . . It must be declared, must this audacious Christian faith, because it is the power of God to the world's salvation, and there is no other power."

The book is not dogmatic in tone, but it is positive in its convictions. The author makes it evident that he is not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ and his reasons are convincing. Not among the least of its attractive features is its fine persuasive style. Old truths are given a new dress. Doctrines are discussed but in the language of a living faith. The book is warmly recommended especially to ministers who need to recapture the romance of preaching the Gospel. Theological students will find it helpful and inspiring.

E. E. FISCHER

Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu. By Joachim Jeremias. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1935. 100 pages. RM 4.50.

This is a learned discussion of the meaning of the words of institution at the Last Supper in the light of the significance of the terms used in the Hebrew and Aramaic and with regard to the traditional ritual of the Passover Meal. In three chapters Jeremias discusses the question as to whether the Last Supper was a Passover Meal, the character of the oldest text of the words of institution, and finally the significance of those words. He shows the symbolic significance of the elements and the various acts, even to the drinking from the common cup, which was what undoubtedly took place at the Last Supper (even Luther has called attention to the symbolic significance of the particular act), but he also demonstrates that the significance of the transaction was not simply that of a symbolic teaching but that it demands an actual impartation of that which Christ states, being both symbolized *and* imparted by the elements in the act of their communication. Though a small volume, it is packed with learning and source material; no one can afford to pass by this monograph in the theological discussion of the Holy Sacrament.

JOHN C. MATTES

Hat die älteste Christenheit die Kindertaufe geübt? By Dr. Joachim Jeremias. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1938. 29 pages.

In this little pamphlet there is a wealth of information, and the name Jeremias assures its trustworthiness. The author insists on the prevalence of the baptism of children in the primitive church, and brings his great fund of rabbinical knowledge to the support of his position. The arguments are sound and convincing with one exception. We are hardly convinced that his theory is correct that during the first few years of its existence a difference was made by the church at Corinth, following the precedent of Jewish Proselyte Baptism, between the baptism of children in Christian households and those of the families of converts. It deserves most careful consideration and study by all who are interested in the question of infant baptism and the historical testimonies relating to it.

JOHN C. MATTES

I Was in Prison (The Suppressed Letters of Imprisoned German Pastors). By Charles S. Macfarland. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1939. 112 pages. \$1.

The letters from imprisoned German pastors are printed as Chapter II. Every letter opens with a passage from the Bible, except the one which begins with an apt quotation from Luther and that other which opens with a few lines from a hymn of praise.

The letters are not sensational but Scriptural. They breathe the spirit of hope and faith. The Christian attitude is maintained in all of them. Each tries to find the best in a bad situation. For example, one good soul writes: "What better thing can there be for a pastor than to be shut up for a time just with his Bible and his prayer-book?"

Some seem to be trying to strengthen their own faith and challenge themselves to loyal devotion to Christ and His church. "It is now becoming more clear . . . how, in the church's struggle, it is above all essential that love must accompany all our doings and turn every service firstly into the service of Christ." Another: "It is only the joyful Gospel of Jesus Christ that can carry us on."

The author writes an introductory chapter and three other informative chapters including the one on the subject: "What Can American Christians Do?"

These letters furnish material for a study of Christian courage.

H. D. HOOVER

Christ on Trial. By K. Schilder. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1939. 549 pages. \$3.

Christ on Trial is the second volume of a trilogy on the Passion in which *Christ in His Suffering* (reviewed in July, 1938) was the first volume. This second volume begins immediately after the arrest with the text, "And (they) led Him away to Annas first; for he was father-in-law to Caiaphas, which was the High Priest that same year" (John 18:13). Concerning the general plan of this three-volume work the author writes on page 507: "The first volume presents Christ as He enters upon His suffering. In that volume we observed Him when He was still unbound, and when He went to and fro among men at the behest of His own will, when He had not yet been delivered into the hands of His judges. This second volume considers Him as He passes through His suffering, while standing over against the court. In this study we are devoting our attention to the *bound* Christ upon whose suffering the human will, the will of Justice as maintained by the authorities, must make a decision. The third volume will presently

deal with Christ as He is at the conclusion of His suffering. It will study Him as He takes upon Himself the results of the sentence pronounced upon Him, and as He drinks the cup of passion to the dregs of death."

Everyone will be richly repaid for a careful reading of *Christ on Trial*. One of the most pronounced features of this book is that it exalts the Christ. The sufferings and death of Jesus of Nazareth were not simply another dramatic historical event. They were due to the eternal plan and counsel of God. Christ died as the Son of God. One can barely read a single page without gaining the conviction that all these things *had* to come to pass. Christ Himself saw very clearly that He was the Lamb of God, supplied by God, and offered to God in fulfillment of God's own unchangeable plan. "For Christ in this same hour the whole of the Scriptures are an open book" (page 444). Everything revolves around Christ, the Messiah. He was fully aware of what was going on, whereas those who thought they were doing things according to their own wills and determination were blindly carrying out the counsels of God. Every move or word or silence of our Lord becomes self-evident and logical. The "conscious predilection is that every detail of the Gospel of the Passion has a definite significance for Christ Himself" (page 481). Because of this point of view the conduct of His accusers, which otherwise may in some cases present a real exegetical problem, becomes quite apparent. Consequently the author avoids the usual speculations and suppositions about the various characters of the Passion History and holds strictly to the story of the redemption as it involves Christ. It is a drama which God Himself is directing, regardless of, or in spite of, men. Hence we read this startling statement, "God Himself now has become Christ's enemy" (page 279). The author, a Reformed theologian, in this connection frequently uses the words "election" and "predestination." He is not inclined to criticize or hold up for reproach Christ's enemies. To the contrary he repeatedly laments and identifies himself, us, with them.

The entire book presents a beautiful harmony and unity of point of view. The continuity of Christ's life and, especially, of the events of the last week are presented in a clear and plausible manner. Occurrences, which might otherwise be looked upon as purely incidental, are presented as part of God's eternal plan. So, for instance, the crowing of the cock at the time of Peter's denial is courageously presented as an act of God. It is the providence of God "which in its sublime purposiveness opens and closes the mouth of a fowl in order that everything may at exactly the right time perform its right function in the universe" (page 213). In a skillful way the actual scenes are reconstructed in such convincing chronological order that one can not help but agree that it must have been just as he says. Even the thought processes of the actors in the passion story are rendered credibly. Dr. Schilder demonstrates not only profound exegesis but also keen psychology.

It is to be expected that one who has such a comprehensive view of Christ's sufferings should emphasize the fulfillment of the Law and Prophecy in the life and death of Christ. Consequently one gains from the reading of *Christ on Trial* not only an appreciation of the Passion History, but the entire Bible rises up before the reader as an holy, awesome handiwork of the Almighty.

Incidents which otherwise might be vexing and difficult to the student of the Passion are satisfactorily explained. So, for instance, the problem of Christ's silence receives a final answer. If you have ever supposed that Christ kept silent before Caiaphas and Herod and Pilate because to speak would not have availed Him anything anyhow, you will learn from *Christ on Trial* that Jesus kept silent just because by speaking He could have changed the outcome of that Friday. "His hour has indeed come, the hour in which He is to die. Therefore He does not want to be kept from the cross by any speech which

would be inspired by something else than His *sense of office*. Nor does He, now that His hour has come, want to postpone or avoid that cross by any such speech" (page 355).

The book is not controversial. One has the impression that the author is simply writing because of His love of the crucified Saviour. It is a devotional book. If other books have presented the Passion from the homiletical point of view, others from the historical point of view, this book presents it from the devotional and spiritual point of view. His presentation is so fresh that one reads it as if one were for the first time reading an essay on the story of Christ's sufferings; and yet he is orthodox and evangelical.

A word about the author himself may add to one's appreciation of the book. Dr. Schilder was born in 1890 and graduated from the theological school of Kampen in 1914. He served several churches as pastor, but left the pastorate to attend the University of Erlangen and in 1933 received the Doctor of Philosophy degree *summa cum laude*. At present he is professor of Ethics and Dogmatics at the University of Kampen, the Netherlands. The book is beautifully printed on heavy book-paper and bound in substantial buckram covers.

FRED W. KERN

Das Heil von Golgatha. By Hermann Bezzel. Stuttgart: D. Gundert Verlag, 1938. 107 pages. RM 1.40.

The seven words of the Crucified were often the themes of the Lenten meditations conducted by Hermann Bezzel, the late prominent and forceful leader of the Lutheran Church of Bavaria. Those on hand were delivered in the year 1913, and have been edited because their content is peculiarly applicable to the chaotic condition of man and mankind of today. Because distracting illustrations and local applications are avoided, these devotional addresses have their place in our country. They are thus *Andachten* in the true sense of the word, having as their two controlling themes: God in Christ and man per se who finds himself standing in the shadow of the Cross. The thoughts of the addresses are not intended for huge mass meetings at which human personalities glitter in the foreground and fascinating ideas may be propounded; they are rather for devotional groups seeking a strengthening of spiritual life. They are personal without being repelling; illuminating without being brilliant; devotional without being sentimental. They are guides, not to intellectual astonishments, but to "*andüchtige Sammlung*."

M. O. DIETRICH

A Lamb Goes Uncomplaining Forth. By Adolph Hoenecke. Translated from the German by Werner Franzmann. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1939. 75 pages, paper. 25 cents.

The seven Lenten sermons presented in this volume were preached fifty years ago in St. Matthews, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The suffering Saviour, the Son, is pictured as bowing under the wrath of God the Father: "The terrors of death under God's wrath almost crushed Him completely." Today Swedish theologians present God as both love and righteousness, rather than the Son of God as love and God the Father as righteousness!

Yet, notwithstanding, these sermons are evangelical and quite in accord with the spirit of Lenten devotions as experienced today. It is a privilege to listen to a voice across five decades, telling of conflicts, problems, joys, and victories experienced also by us today.

There is a contemporaneous sound in such statements as: "Christians do not pray;" "There is much of the Pharisee in us;" "On Wednesday evenings many could not find time to come to our Lenten services, who on other evenings of the week went streaming into secular gatherings."

The sermons deal with our Saviour between Gethsemane and Calvary.

H. D. HOOVER

The Tragedy of Calvary. By C. A. D. Freseman. Columbus: Book Concern, 1938. 102 pages. 75 cents.

The above is a "Poem on the Passion History" as stated on the jacket of the book. The tragic story of the cross is here told in one continuous poem of nearly 300 stanzas. There are many marginal sub-heads enabling the reader to adapt the stanzas to other themes of thought. There are three stanzas on each page, with wide margins and good spacing, making easy reading. The poem is of eight lines to the stanza, each line (or verse) comprising four metrical feet. The lines are in couplets and made to rhyme with ease and naturalness.

As the story of events unfolds, impressive devotional suggestions appear. About it all there is not only the genius of the poet author, but the breath of piety in an atmosphere of beauty. We enter the sacred precincts of the poem as one "Seeking Light:"

Take me in spirit, Lord, with Thee
From Kedron's Brook to Calvary;
That, as again I meditate
The record of Thy passion great,
With stronger faith, and deeper love,
I serve Thee, who didst from above
Come down to earth to reconcile
A holy God with sinner vile.

The scene in the garden is made personal by:

"To watch and pray"—how oft that word
Have I a care-free sinner heard!
I'm told for me He intercedes,
At throne of mercy for me pleads.
Yet, seeming oft on worship bent,
I have been all too much content
With self, convinced of native power
To overcome temptation dour.

"Love's Service" at the cross is shown by:

Hard by the cross of Jesus see
In deep dejection women three:
The Virgin mother, wan and worn,
Lamenting loss of her Firstborn;
Her sister Mary standing by,
No doubt to comfort her would try;
And Mary Magdalene was there
For she would mother's vigil share.

A personal note of lasting comfort is seen in a stanza following the Lord's commending of His Spirit into the Father's hands:

When ends for me life's pilgrimage,
And I must pass from this world's stage,
I know full well I cannot plead
That always I His will did heed;
But this I know, when comes the end,
My soul I may to Him commend
Who also me as child does own
Through grace by faith in His dear Son.

Its pages are 4 x 6 inches in size and the little volume can easily be carried in the coat pocket—a delightful book for travel, providing the imagination of the poet, the rhythm of a song, and the true spirit of devotion.

C. P. SWANK

The Door of Hope. By Frieda J. Schneider. Columbus: Lutheran Book Concern, 1938. 192 pages. 75 cents.

This "Book of Comfort for the Afflicted" is of large pocket size. There are four divisions under the headings of "Our Afflictions" (thirty-one pages); "Our Comfort" (sixty pages); "Our Opportunities and Duties" (sixty-one pages); and "Special Days and Seasons" (thirty-two pages).

The chapters are short, comprising about two pages. Each is introduced by a brief Scripture quotation or reference, contains a practical message concluding with a verse of some suitable hymn, and a brief prayer. The first general section strives in its fifteen chapters, to reveal the Christian's attitude toward suffering: Tribulation is necessary for entering the Kingdom of God; all Christian brethren have their afflictions. Our Lord, on the cross, glorified all suffering in His faith. God is not unrighteous, nor unkind, but permits affliction for the accomplishing of His purpose.

The second section, "Our Comfort," shows the more hopeful side of suffering as illuminated by the Resurrection. This is developed under such headings as, "The Promise of Comfort," "The Power of Jesus' Name," "The Cure for Worry," "Our Trusted Friend," "When Jesus Walks With Us," "The Lord is My Shepherd," "The Light at Eventide," etc. The section closes with the following prayer: "Merciful Father in heaven, we praise Thy goodness to all the children of men and Thy special goodness to the unfortunate. Help us to trust in Thee with all our hearts. Enable us to rejoice in Thy salvation and stimulate us to noble efforts for the advancement of Thy Kingdom. For Jesus' sake. Amen."

The unusual feature of this book is in the third section where an attempt is made to encourage life by being useful regardless of handicaps. Life has many opportunities for happiness and service, if we cultivate the vision to see them.

The closing section comprises meditations upon the Words from the Cross, and messages for special days such as Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, Thanksgiving, and New Year. The book closes with an appropriate New Year's hymn.

There are many books of this type and each makes its appeal to special needs. This one will undoubtedly prove of great value, not so much to the minister, but to the suffering and unfortunate.

C. P. SWANK

The Son of God Rides On. By R. E. Golladay. Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1938. 388 pages. \$1.75.

This volume is another series of sermon outlines from the prolific pen of Dr. Golladay. It treats the Gospel lessons of the ancient church. It is of the same standard as his other volume of outlines, and the many pastors who have found Dr. Golladay's outlines helpful in the past will find this latest book just as helpful.

ALFRED J. KRAHMER

Come into My Heart. By Henry Young. Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, n. d. 79 pages. 75 cents.

This book is a series of eight Lenten sermons based upon the general theme of Revelation 3:30, "There is a knock at your door." Each of the sermons presents a different aspect of Christ's ministry for man. For example, the Good Friday sermon represents a knock on the door of our heart by "Someone who Died for You;" the Easter sermon by "Someone who Lives for You."

These sermons are soundly evangelical and truly devotional in spirit. They contain many helpful Lenten thoughts.

ALFRED J. KRAHMER

A Book of Prayers for Boys and Girls. By G. J. Neumann. Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, n. d. 192 pages. 50 cents.

Here is a helpful little book. It offers prayers for the use of children from infancy to the confirmation age. It offers prayers for practically every circumstance of a child's life, including the relation of the child to his church.

ALFRED J. KRAHMER

Wives of the Bible. By W. B. Riley. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1938. 119 pages. \$1.

Eight textual sermons, each on a different woman of the Bible, are used by this author as a spring-board for the expression of his own ideas on the subject of women, here, there, and everywhere. His treatment of the Bible is that of the Fundamentalist, and his ideas are typically far removed from the present. Such sermons will continue to keep the barrier high between the intelligent and the church of today.

H. E. HORN

The Grip that Holds. Compiled by Chester M. Savage. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1938. 184 pages. \$1.50.

This is a collection of evangelistic sermons by Oklahoma Baptist preachers. The fifteen sermons are of course of very different worth. There seems to be no reason why such different sermons of mediocre character should be presented thus. The lover of sermons will find little in this book that can even achieve mediocrity.

H. E. HORN

At the Gates of Mercy. By John H. Webb. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1938. 96 pages. \$1.

The prayers of characters with whom Jesus came in contact make the subject matter for these ten sermonettes. The studies are expository and are sane, interesting, and thought-provoking. Sometimes we feel that the author is merely rehearsing his knowledge of customs and manners in New Testament times. But in the midst of much that is uninteresting, and much that is well known, there lie many fresh thoughts which show the author to be a student of the New Testament. They will be of profit to most readers.

H. E. HORN

Why Was I Not Told? By E. W. Marquardt. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1939. 107 pages. 75 cents.

The author of this book is a medical practitioner, a Christian, and a philosopher and with this combination one does find a most helpful volume for every parent and every prospective parent. The author is direct and practical and covers a wide field of subjects—heredity, environment, self-control, health, sleep, worry, temper, clothing, education, eating habits, selection of a mate in marriage, personality development, proper sex knowledge, and a fine, practical discussion of "The Three Great Dangers"—the two venereal diseases and the use of alcohol. To me this was the best and most valuable part of the book.

In my mind, throughout the book, was a feeling that the author lost something in covering so many factors in such a small volume. This seemed particularly true in the parts on sexual matters. However, one must remember this is not a minute psychological treatment but a more general practical discussion. Pastors, social workers, leaders of youth will find much that is of benefit herein, as will those seeking to prevent rather than to cure causes of unhappiness in their personal lives.

HENRY CORNEHLSSEN, JR.

Gespräch mit Berneuchen. By Gerhard Kunze. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1938. 50 pages.

The Berneuchen movement is of great interest to all who have noted the liturgical revival that is sweeping over the church in all lands after the blight of Reformed baldness and coldness has been at least partly eliminated. This discussion, which is written by a liturgical scholar who is in sympathy with the revival of a real Lutheran cultus, raises several questions about the liturgical revival of the Berneuchen Brotherhood, particularly their publication, *Die Ordnung der deutschen Messe*, and its introduction of an Amnesis and Epiklesis. With respect to the latter the author expresses grave doubts and asks whether there is not a new teaching concerning the Sacrament involved in what is here offered. We believe his point is well taken and commend this discussion to the careful consideration of all those who are inclined towards the introduction of such a liturgical addition to the services of the church.

JOHN C. MATTES

Vår Lutherske Arv. Et festskrift til 400 års-jubileet for reformasjonens infoerelse i Norge. Utgitt av Norges Lutherlag ved Sigurd Norman. Oslo: Norges Lutherlags Forlag, 1937. 400 pages. Kr. 8.

Our Lutheran Heritage, as the title indicates, was published in connection with the 400th anniversary of the introduction of the Reformation into Norway. This volume contains twenty-five articles, largely historical and doctrinal, by as many prominent professors, bishops, parochial clergy, and leaders of the Church of Norway. A list of some of the titles of the articles will indicate the scope of the work and those it will interest: Martin Luther, the Reformer of the Church, When the Reformation Came to Norway, The Lutheran Teaching of Predestination, Lutheran Preaching and Worship, Luther as Hymn Writer, Luther's Family Life, Lutheranism and the Social Problem, The National Element in the Lutheran Reformation, Luther and Inner Missions.

BENJAMIN LOTZ

Religionen Hos Urkulturens Folk. Olaus-Petri-Föreläsningar Vid Uppsala Universitet.
By Wilhelm Schmidt, S. V. D. Översättning från Författarens Manuskript av Erik Gren. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrrelsens Bokförlag, 1936. 156 pages.
Kr. 3.50.

This little volume is the translation of a series of lectures given under the auspices of the Olaus Petri Foundation at the University of Uppsala. The author, a well-known Viennese professor, seeks to present religion as it appears among the most primitive cultural groups. In doing it, he shows that their conception of God is monotheistic and His attributes are moral in character. The author takes issue with the work of Archbishop Nathan Söderblom who emphasized the evolutionary character of primitive religious concepts. The publication of this, as well as of the other volumes in this series, indicates the breadth of interest on the part of Swedish theologians.

BENJAMIN LOTZ

The Cross Athwart the Sky. By R. E. Golladay. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1939. 148 pages. \$1.

These Lenten addresses are a real addition to good and helpful Lenten literature. The sermons are fresh from the pulpit and refreshing to the soul. Each one is preceded by the Scripture lesson printed out in full and a prayer. The concluding prayer is also given.

Careful reading of the book turns the searchlight of stirring questions upon the reader. "What does Lent mean to me?" "Have you ever had a bad conscience . . . that made you toss restless and sleepless in bed at night?" But it is stronger in its interpretation of the teaching and sufferings of Christ. It provokes further thinking on "these things." I have written notes and suggestions on many margins and pages as a result of reading it. It should prove a helpful book to pastors and preachers.

H. D. HOOVER

A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. By Theodore Graebner. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1939. 282 pages. \$1.95.

The importance of the Commentary on Galatians by Dr. Martin Luther in the history of Protestantism can scarcely be overestimated. But lectures delivered in 1531 are difficult reading in 1939. In the Weidman Edition of Luther's works this commentary fills 733 pages. The English translations of Luther's Latin are generally unsatisfactory. Few read this important work of Martin Luther because it is so lengthy, the language is archaic, and there is much material in the original lectures and comments which is not applicable to our time.

The author of this new translation and abridgement purposed "to make Luther talk as he would talk today to Americans." In this he has succeeded very well; at least he has given us the thought of Luther in a form that is most readable. It is interesting, invigorating and stimulating. The reader is not only refreshed in memory of the teaching of the Reformer regarding salvation by grace through faith, but he is reminded forcibly of Luther's virile emphasis upon the law of God. The function and purpose of the Law are set forth as emphatically as the meaning of the Gospel. In this volume we may review and revive our knowledge of the way of salvation as it works out in our world of today. No doubt it will be to many a refreshing spring of evangelical sermons, helping to a keener insight into theology. No one can read it carefully without enriching his knowledge of Christology. Yet at the same time herein is to be found a practical guide to Christian living.

The volume contains six chapters according to the number of chapters in the Epistle. The task of presenting the teachings of Luther in modern language and in a briefer form demands the head and heart of a great Lutheran and a good scholar. We trust that the response to this effort accomplished so well in *The Commentary on Galatians*, will be such that other writings of Luther may also be given to the church in this attractive and usable form.

H. D. HOOVER

Exodus. By Georg Beer and Kurt Galling. (Handbuch zum Alten Testament.)
Tübingen: Mohr, 1939. 179 pages. RM 7.60 (Subscription price RM 6.80).

With one or two exceptions the *Handbuch zum Alten Testament* series bids fair to become as famous as its sister-series on the New Testament. The latest addition, on Exodus, by Beer and Galling furnishes an excellent example of constructive Biblical scholarship. Of course the whole series is designed for those who have the will to pursue their studies beyond the popular stage. It is not a book for one who does not want to think hard and relentlessly. It is primarily a book for study.

The historical part of the commentary is done by Professor Beer; the institutional chapters (25-31; 35-40) by Professor Galling whose *Biblisches Reallexikon* forms part of the above mentioned series. He has also done the temple and altar sections in Bertholet's *Hesekiel*. Numerous illustrations photograph the explanatory text. Accepting the given analysis of the book of Exodus, one finds Galling's portrayal of the ark, the tabernacle and the priestly vestments quite interesting and illuminating when compared with cultural antecedents and later developments.

Professor Beer accepts the critical theory of the construction of the Pentateuch: he analyzes the content of Exodus judiciously, though he chooses to use the older symbols for the earlier strata rather than those employed by the editor in his *Einleitung zum Alten Testament*. The table on pp. 12-13 will prove most useful to the student. The author points out the common hero pattern underlying the figure of Moses. He thinks the "Jahu" form of the divine name older than the longer form "Jahwe," and like Littmann, Buttmann and de Wette believes it related to the Aryan *Dyau-s*. Likewise Adonai appears to be connected with Adon or Adonis. The plagues, while not morally above the magic of the Egyptians, are to be interpreted as miracles (in the mind of the writer of Exodus) in Yahweh's contest with the Pharaoh, the representative of the gods of Egypt. There is an excellent treatment of the Passover: its elements, growth and significance, the rite itself and the relationship of strangers thereto are detailed with precision. It is to be observed that blood-unity is not as strong as religious unity. Of especial interest is the part played by the family, an organizational phase never abandoned in Israel and responsible for much of the nation's religious and moral tenacity. The discussion of the legal material is of high caliber. The moral decalogue of Ex.20 is held to be a product of the exile intended to conserve the religious principles of Yahwism in lieu of the cultus that ceased with the destruction of the temple and impossible of execution in Babylon.

One might proceed almost indefinitely to discuss the wealth of material brought together here. Attention ought to be called to the splendid translation, the adequate textual notes, and the several excursions on the more important problems of Exodus, such as the call of Moses, the location of Sinai-Horeb, the divine name, Aaron, Levi, the place of crossing (the Red Sea), the Book of the Covenant, the decalogue of Ex. 34, the historicity of the Sinai covenant, the historical relationships of the golden calf episode. The bibliography is somewhat weakened by the omission of such standard English works as Oesterley and Robinson, *A History of Israel*; Olmstead, *History of Palestine and Syria*; Lods, *Israel*; Bacon, *Triple Tradition of the Exodus*, and Smith, *The Origin and History of Hebrew Law*.

J. M. MYERS

Archaeology and the New Testament. By Stephen L. Caiger. London: Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1939. x, 194 pages. 4/6.

Here is a brief, popular treatment on the bearing of archaeology and modern discovery on the New Testament. It is a companion volume to the author's *Bible and Spade* which deals with similar materials with reference to the Old Testament. The importance of the subject needs no advocacy; it is self-evident. Every lover of the Bible welcomes any light that may be thrown upon it by archaeologist or critic. Mr. Caiger has written for the general reader who will find ample material here to stimulate his appetite for more interested study of the New Testament.

Early portraits and relics of Christ, such as splinters from the cross, the Shroud of Turin, the Chalice of Antioch and the Wiegand cup are discussed. Many of these relics and utensils are very late and none were "actually used by them (Christ and the Apostles) as they went about their sacred business in the Holy Land of the early first century." Following this is a detailed description of the successive walls of Jerusalem, the various remains of the Herodian age at Jerash, Amman, Frank Mountain, Baniyas, Makur (Machaerus), and Sebastiyeh, all of which bear evidence of the elaborate building enterprises of Herod and reflect contemporary cultural ideology of inestimable importance for a proper understanding of Gospel backgrounds. There is also a discussion of the environs of Jerusalem with particular reference to the Virgin's Spring, Monuments of Helena, queen of Adiabene, a contemporary of Paul, and the aqueduct of Pilate. Consideration is given to the sacred places: the temple, the place of the crucifixion, the sepulchre, etc. Sacred sites are dealt with separately; especially interesting are the Pauline places, notably the two Antiochs, Athens, Corinth, Ephesus and Rome.

The bearing of inscriptional monuments, Monumentum Ancyranum, the Lapis Tiburtinus, the Sergius Paulus inscription, the Tomb-Robber's inscription, the synagogue inscription of Theodotus, and the inscription of a veteran of the Tenth Legion which served in the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, on various problems of the New Testament is set forth simply and clearly, though one may not always agree with the conclusions drawn. It is gratifying to note the author's insistence upon the importance of graffiti and ostraca for an appreciation of the common life in which the early Christians lived and worked. The papyri too must be studied; they offer much linguistic and social insight into otherwise obscure words, phrases and situations current everywhere on the pages of the New Testament.

While Caiger leans heavily on Dalman, Sir George Adam Smith, Deissmann, and others whose works are obviously fundamental for New Testament study, he has produced a notable volume. It will prove helpful for Sunday school teachers and busy preachers who desire to refresh their memories on the contribution of archaeology to the study of the New Testament.

J. M. MYERS

DON'T READ THE PROTESTANT DIGEST

Unless You Want the Bitter Truth!

... The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism ... Ministers' Lynching Party ... Barth's Amazing Letter to a Czech Friend (translated) ... Story of a Spanish Missionary in Franco-Spain ... Prayer, the Blood of the Soul ... Will Ireland be another Spain? ... Listen to John Penry ... What is a heretic? ... Sixty items ... factual ... critical ... devotional ... original Story of Chinese "Red Army" going to Mass.

Pope Pius, Rufus Jones, Thomas Mann, W. A. Forrester, Albert Peel, Samuel Miller, Julia Clark, D. W. Langridge, William Teeling, Wayne Bowers, Novotny, Douglas Stewart, William Tindale, W. G. Symons, and many others.

Send one dollar for five months' trial

PROTESTANT DIGEST, INC.

14 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts

BOOKS RECEIVED

For the information of its readers and in acknowledgment to the publishers, THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY publishes the following list of books received. More extended notice will be given to as many of them as space permits.

Allen, Cady H., *The Message of the Book of Revelation*. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1939. 180 pages. \$1.50.

Day, Albert Edward, *The Evangel of a New World*. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1939. 160 pages. \$1.50.

Doerffler, Alfred, *The Yoke Made Easy*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1935. 119 pages. Paper, 35 cents.

Douglass, Paul F., *The Story of German Methodism: Biography of an Immigrant Soul*. New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1939. 297, 64 pages, illustrated. \$2.50.

Himnario Evangelico Luterano (Spanish Hymnal). Segunda Edicion. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1939. 136 pages. 75 cents.

Manuale Religioso Ed Inni Sacri (Italian Hymnal). Tradotti dal Andrea Bongarzone. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1939. 158 pages. 75 cents.

New Testament History. A Survey of the Life of Christ and the History of the Apostolic Church for Sunday School Teachers. By W. Arndt. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1939. 102 pages, paper. 25 cents. *Instructor's Guide* for the same, \$1. Test Sheets, 10 cents.

COMMON SERVICE BOOK BINDINGS AND SUPPLEMENTARY PUBLICATIONS

For the Pastor's Personal and Chancel Use

LARGE WORD EDITION

Size, $4\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ inches.

No. 525. Fine Morocco, Divinity Circuit, flexible, red under gold edges, leather lined, back title in gold, silk headbands and marker \$6.00

No. 526. RED Turkey Morocco, limp, leather lined, round corners, gold roll, red under gold edges, silk headbands and marker \$7.00

MUSIC EDITIONS

AUTHORIZED EDITION

One to Three Stanzas Printed Between the Staves of the Music.

Printed on Bible paper, except No. 590. Size, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8$ inches.

No. 594. Persian Morocco, semi-flexible, gold-rolled, red under gold edges, gold title on back, and gold cross on side, silk headbands and marker \$6.00

No. 595. RED Turkey Morocco, semi-flexible, round corners, gold roll, back title in gold, red under gold edges, silk headbands and marker \$10.00

REVISED EDITION

With Words Separate from the Music. Printed on Bible paper. $6 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches.

No. 503. Persian Morocco, gold-rolled, red under gold edges, gold title on back, and gold cross on side, silk headbands and marker \$6.00

SUPPLEMENTARY TO THE COMMON SERVICE BOOK

THE OCCASIONAL SERVICES

This EDITION of this conventional pocket-size MANUAL FOR THE PASTOR contains the "Occasional Services" from the "Common Service Book" together with thirty new orders and offices. Provision is thus made for practically every occasion in the life of the Church for which a service form is required.

Size, $4\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ inches. Red under gold edges, silk headbands and marker.

No. 1. French Morocco, limp, book paper..... \$1.75

No. 2. Persian Morocco, flexible, keratol lined, thin, Bible paper \$3.25

No. 3. RED Turkey Morocco, flexible, keratol lined, thin, Bible paper \$3.50

ALTAR SERVICE

A special LARGE TYPE edition of the "Common Service Book" for altar use, with paging harmonizing with the word editions. Contents: The Service, Matins, Vespers; Introits, Collects, Epistles, Graduals, Gospels; Collects and Prayers—The Litany, The Suffrages, The Morning and Evening Suffrages, The Bidding Prayer, The Psalms.

Size, $7\frac{1}{2} \times 10\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Beveled boards, keratol lined, back title in gold, silk headbands and markers. Heavy Book Paper, red under gold edges.

No. 12. BLACK Leather \$ 9.00

No. 13. RED Leather 10.00

No. 14. BLACK Turkey Morocco 16.00

No. 15. RED Turkey Morocco 18.00

COLLECTS AND PRAYERS

Authorized by the United Lutheran Church in America

Prepared by the Common Service Book Committee

A collection of collects and prayers supplementing those provided in "The Common Service Book." These have been chosen from the devotional writings of all ages and include prayers especially written for this volume.

A wide range of conditions and circumstances is provided for, the 399 collects and prayers and the thirty general prayers being grouped under more than 250 classifications.

This manual will serve as a valuable aid, for specific use or as suggestively helpful, for the pastor, and also for church workers, church organizations, and the family circle.

Price, Cloth, \$1.00; Black Morocco, red under gold edges, \$3.50; Red Morocco, red under gold edges, \$3.75.

THE UNITED LUTHERAN PUBLICATION HOUSE

1228-1234 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa.